arXiv:1601.00294v3 [quant-ph] 14 Nov 2016

Large Block Properties of the Entanglement Entropy of Free Disordered Fermions

A.Elgart
Department of Mathematics, Virginia Tech,
Blacksburg, VA, 24061, USA
L.Pastur, M. Shcherbina
Mathematical Division, B.Verkin Institute
for Low Temperature Physics and Engineering
Kharkiv, 61103, Ukraine

November 15, 2016

Abstract

We consider a macroscopic disordered system of free d-dimensional lattice fermions whose one-body Hamiltonian is a Schrödinger operator H with ergodic potential. We assume that the Fermi energy lies in the exponentially localized part of the spectrum of H. We prove that if S_Λ is the entanglement entropy of a lattice cube Λ of side length L of the system, then for any $d \geq 1$ the expectation $\mathbf{E}\{L^{-(d-1)}S_\Lambda\}$ has a finite limit as $L \to \infty$ and we identify the limit. Next, we prove that for $d = 1$ the entanglement entropy admits a well defined asymptotic form for all typical realizations (with probability 1) as $L \to \infty$. According to numerical results of [33] the limit is not selfaveraging even for an i.i.d. potential. On the other hand, we show that for $d \geq 2$ and an i.i.d. random potential the variance of $L^{-(d-1)}S_\Lambda$ decays polynomially as $L \to \infty$, i.e., the entanglement entropy is selfaveraging.

1 Introduction

Entanglement is a fundamental feature of quantum mechanics manifested in non-local, intrinsically quantum correlations between separated quantum systems. Used first by Einstein, Rosen and Podolsky in 1935 to demonstrate the incompleteness of quantum description, entanglement was coined and explicitly defined by Schrödinger shortly thereafter. Nowadays entanglement is an object of extensive studies ranging from general relativity, cosmology, and foundation of quantum mechanics through quantum optics and quantum statistical mechanics to quantum information and computation. Among the wide variety of ideas, problems and results concerning entanglement phenomena, there ia a considerable amount of those dealing with many body (macroscopic) systems, common in statistical mechanics and condensed matter physics (see the recent reviews [7, 12, 14, 25]). Consider a bipartite macroscopic quantum system $\mathfrak{S}$

$$\mathfrak{S} = \mathfrak{B} \cup \mathfrak{E}, \tag{1.1}$$

consisting of a block $\mathfrak{B}$ and its "environment" $\mathfrak{E}$. It is assumed that $\mathfrak{S}$ occupies a macroscopic domain $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ of characteristic size N, $\mathfrak{B}$ occupies a subdomain $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{D}$ of the characteristic

size L, and one is interested in the degree to which $\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{E}$ are correlated in the asymptotic regime

$$1 \ll L \ll N. \tag{1.2}$$

For a pure state ρ of $\mathfrak{S}$, a widely used measure of the corresponding correlations is the von Neumann entropy, defined by

$$S_\Lambda = -\operatorname{Tr}_\Lambda \rho_\Lambda \log_2 \rho_\Lambda, \tag{1.3}$$

where ρ_Λ denotes the reduced density matrix associated with the block $\mathfrak{B}$. One of the central problems in the field is the determination of the asymptotic behavior of the entanglement entropy in the asymptotic regime (1.2). One usually takes the macroscopic limit $N \to \infty$ for $\mathfrak{S}$ first whenever it is possible, which reduces the problem to finding the large L asymptotics of S_Λ for a block of size L of the infinite many body system.

It has been found in the recent decades that the large block asymptotics of the entanglement entropy (1.3) may be unusual if ρ is a ground state of the system, or, more generally, an eigenstate of the system. Namely, it was shown in several physics works that the entanglement entropy can be asymptotically proportional to the surface area L^{d-1} of the block rather than its volume L^d as $L \to \infty$. The latter (extensive) asymptotics is standard for thermal states in quantum statistical mechanics [36], while the former was found first in cosmology and quantum field theory and later in other fields, and is known as *area law* [7, 12, 14]. It has also been found that the area law asymptotics is not always valid, e.g., at quantum critical points of several one-dimensional translation invariant quantum spin chains, for which the entanglement entropy grows like $\log L$ rather than remaining bounded [12].

More generally, area law asymptotics $S_\Lambda \sim L^{d-1}$ for the entanglement entropy are believed to be valid for quantum systems with finite range interaction and a gap between the ground state energy and the rest of the spectrum, while other asymptotics are possible for gapless systems. In particular, some systems that have a quantum phase transition may exhibit asymptotics of the form $S_\Lambda \sim L^{d-1} \log L$, [7, 25]. Determining whether an eigenstate of the system is spectrally isolated from the rest of the spectrum is generally a daunting task that was undertaken mostly for certain one dimensional exactly solvable models. On the other hand, there is a class of simpler models that can be either gapless or gapped and exhibit accordingly either type of aforementioned asymptotics, in any dimension.

Concretely, examples of quantum systems with this property are given by quasifree fermions described by Hamiltonians that are quadratic in the creation and annihilation operators. Such systems arise in condensed matter theory and statistical mechanics (models describing electrons in metals, including superconductors, other models with mean field type approximations, exactly solvable spin chains, etc.).

For these Hamiltonians with finite range and translation invariant coefficients the large L behavior of the entanglement entropy in a gapless case was initially studied in [16, 19, 43], where either the upper and lower bounds of order $O(L^{d-1} \log L)$ for the entanglement entropy were obtained or the asymptotic formula of the same order of magnitude was proposed by using certain conjectures on the subleading term in the Szegő theorem for Töplitz determinants with discontinuous symbols. The precise asymptotic behavior for such systems was recently established rigorously in [26] by using rather sophisticated techniques of modern operator theory [39, 40, 41].

All results mentioned above deal with translation invariant systems. Following a widely accepted paradigm in condensed matter physics, it is natural to consider a disordered version of the free fermion model. To this end, one replaces the translation invariant coefficients of the fermionic quadratic Hamiltonian by random coefficients, which are translation invariant in the mean and have decaying statistical correlation, i.e., ergodic. This is the standard setting for the theory of disordered systems [28, 31].

The analysis of the many body quadratic Hamiltonian reduces to that of a certain one body operator determined by the coefficients of the original Hamiltonian [9]. Thus, in the case of random coefficients we obtain a problem in the theory of one body disordered systems, related to the phenomenon of Anderson localization.

Specifically, one can consider the case, where $\mathfrak{S}$ of (1.1) is the system of free fermions in their ground- (or just eigen-) state having a discrete Schrödinger operator H with random (more generally ergodic, see (2.3) and (2.12) – (2.13)) potential as the one body operator. It is known that the spectrum of H is non random and consists of intervals $[E_{2j-1}, E_{2j}]$, for $j = 1, ..., p$, referred to as bands. Moreover, in certain adjacent to band edges subintervals $[E_{2j-1}, E'_{2j-1}]$ and $[E'_{2j}, E_{2j}]$, for $E'_{2j-1} \leq E'_{2j}$ and some j's, the spectrum (especially in the case of i.i.d. potentials) is almost surely of pure point type and the corresponding eigenfunctions are exponentially localized. We will call these subintervals *exponentially localized parts of the spectrum* of H. The parts can be characterized by the exponential decay of the expectations of the off diagonal entries of various important spectral characteristics, e.g. the spectral projections of H (see (2.21) and (2.22)), fractional powers of the Green function of H (see (4.41) – (4.41)), etc. [6, 32].

It was shown rigorously in [33] (see also related works [1, 2]) that if the Fermi energy μ lies in either the spectral gap or the exponentially localized part of the spectrum of H, then the expectation $\mathbf{E}\{S_\Lambda\}$ of the entanglement entropy S_Λ of a lattice cube Λ of side length L admits a two-sided bound of the form

$$C_- L^{d-1} \leq \mathbf{E}\{S_\Lambda\} \leq C_+ L^{d-1},\ 0 < C_- \leq C_+ < \infty. \tag{1.4}$$

The spectral gap case is fairly simple and follows from general principles of spectral theory, while the gapless case follows from the exponential decay of the expectation of the off diagonal matrix elements of the Fermi projection, one of fundamental results in the theory of localization. For $d = 1$ and $L \gg 1$, the two-sided bound for the entanglement entropy for almost all realizations of disorder was also obtained in [33] and then was used to show numerically that the entanglement entropy of one dimensional disordered lattice fermions is not selfaveraging, i.e., has non vanishing random fluctuations even if $L \gg 1$.

In this paper we will assume that the Fermi energy μ lies in the exponentially localized parts of the spectrum. We first prove that in any dimension there exists a "surface macroscopic" limit

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} L^{-(d-1)} \mathbf{E}\{S_\Lambda\} \tag{1.5}$$

of the entanglement entropy per unit surface area of a cubic block Λ with a side length L. The limit is not zero and finite in view of (1.4), see Result 2 and Theorem 3.5 below.

In other words, the entanglement entropy of disordered fermions satisfies *area law in the mean.*

We then show that for $d \geq 2$ the variance of $L^{-(d-1)} S_\Lambda$ vanishes polynomially fast in L as $L \to \infty$, i.e., that for $d \geq 2$ the entanglement entropy of disordered lattice fermions is selfaveraging, see Result 4 and Theorem 3.7.

For $d = 1$ we establish that S_Λ has a well defined asymptotic form as $L \to \infty$ for all typical realizations of disorder (with probability 1), see Result 3 and Theorem 3.6 below. According to the numerical results of [33], the corresponding asymptotic expression is a non trivial random variable, i.e., the entanglement entropy of disordered lattice fermions is not selfaveraging in the one dimensional case.

Note that the selfaveraging property, i.e., the disappearance of fluctuations of appropriately normalized extensive observables in the macroscopic limit, is widely known in condensed matter theory and statistical mechanics of disordered systems [28, 31]. In entanglement studies the essentially analogous property is known as entanglement typicality (see e.g. the recent

reviews [13, 25]). Entanglement typicality allows one to consider the entanglement characteristics, which are "typical", i.e., random with respect to a certain multivariate probability distribution, provided that the distribution is strongly peaked in a number of variables.

It is worth mentioning that in a number of studied cases the multivariate probability distribution is chosen to be the normalized Haar measure of the multidimensional unitary group $U(N)$, which is unfortunately not always easy to interpret physically. In particular, it is not simple to identify unambiguously the physical dimension and size of the quantum system in question. Note that both quantities enter explicitly in the large block asymptotics of the entanglement entropy (cf. (1.4) and (1.5)). On the other hand, the ground state (or an eigenstate, more generally) of N free disordered lattice fermions is just the Slater determinant of N eigenfunctions of a d-dimensional Schrödinger operator with a random (or in greater generality ergodic) potential and Λ is just a cubic block in $\mathbb{Z}^d$. In this simple framework, we can explicitly study the various entanglement properties and characteristics of the free fermion system, establishing, in particular, that the entanglement entropy per unit surface is typical for $d \geq 2$ and is not typical for $d = 1$.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we outline the setting and formulate our main results for the large block behavior of the entanglement entropy of free disordered fermions whose one body operator is a Schrödinger operator with an ergodic potential. These results are particular cases of assertions, valid for more general quantities and a broader class of one body ergodic operators. We formulate and prove these assertions in Section 3. The proofs rely on a number of auxiliary facts, which are in turn proved in Section 4. In Section 5 we present our outlook and draw our conclusions.

Throughout the paper we will use the symbols C, C_1, c, c_1, etc. for quantities which may be different in different expressions and whose value is not essential for the validity of the corresponding formulas. For a set $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, we will denote by $\mathcal{C}^c = \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \mathcal{C}$ its complement, by $|\mathcal{C}|$ its cardinality and by $\chi_{\mathcal{C}}$ its indicator function (that can be thought of as the projection operator from $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ onto $\ell^2(\mathcal{C})$).

2 Results

In this section we present our main results on the large block behavior of the entanglement entropy of free disordered fermions whose one body operator is a Schrödinger operator with an ergodic potential (see Results 1 – 4). The results are corollaries of more general facts (see Theorems 3.4 – 3.7), which are formulated and proved in Sections 3 and 4.

2.1 Generalities

Let A be a bounded hermitian operator acting on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ and let $A(x, y) = \langle \delta_x, A\delta_y \rangle$ be its $(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{Z}^d$ matrix elements. We consider a system of spinless lattice fermions confined to a finite domain $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ and described by the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{D}} = \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{D}} A(x, y) c_x^+ c_y, \tag{2.1}$$

quadratic in the Fermi creation and annihilation operators $c_x^+, c_x,\ x \in \mathcal{D}$. The prototypical example for A that we will focus on in this paper is

$$A = H - \mu, \tag{2.2}$$

where μ is a parameter (the Fermi energy) to be chosen below and H is a discrete Schrödinger operator

$$H = -\Delta + V, \tag{2.3}$$

acting on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. Here, Δ is the d-dimensional discrete Laplacian

$$(\Delta\psi)(x) = \sum_{|x-y|=1} \psi(y),\ x \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \tag{2.4}$$

and

$$(V\psi)(x) = V(x)\psi(x),\ x \in \mathbb{Z}^d. \tag{2.5}$$

is the potential.

Note that the definition (1.3) of the entanglement entropy for bipartite fermionic systems (or, more generally, indistinguishable particles) does not exactly coincide with that for quantum systems of distinguishable quantum entities (spins, qubits), which are often considered in quantum information theory and related studies of quantum spin chains [7, 12, 14]. Indeed, according to (1.3), the entanglement entropy is determined by the reduced density matrix ρ_Λ. In the distinguishable case, one usually represents the Hilbert state space of the bipartite system $\mathfrak{S}$ (1.1) as the tensor product $\mathcal{H}_\mathfrak{S} = \mathcal{H}_\mathfrak{B} \otimes \mathcal{H}_\mathfrak{E}$ of the Hilbert state spaces of parties $\mathfrak{B}$ and $\mathfrak{E}$. This allows one to introduce the partial traces Tr_Λ, $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{D}\setminus\Lambda}$, $\mathrm{Tr}_\mathcal{D} := \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{D}\setminus\Lambda}\mathrm{Tr}_\Lambda$, and define $\rho_\Lambda = \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{D}\setminus\Lambda}\,\rho_\mathcal{D}$. Clearly, we cannot proceed in the same fashion in the indistinguishable case. Instead we will use the definition of the reduced density matrix which is common in quantum statistical mechanics and identifies it as the corresponding quantum correlation function. Namely, let O_Λ be the (local) subalgebra of the algebra $O_\mathcal{D}$ of observables of the whole bipartite composite (1.1), i.e., O_Λ is the set of all polynomials $\{\pi_\Lambda\}$ in the creation and annihilation Fermi operators indexed by the points in the set Λ occupied by the block $\mathfrak{B}$. We then define ρ_Λ via the relation $\mathrm{Tr}\ \pi_\Lambda\rho_\mathcal{D} = \mathrm{Tr}\ \pi_\Lambda\rho_\Lambda$ required to hold for all $\pi_\Lambda \in O_\Lambda$. We refer the reader to the works [7, 8, 14, 23, 37] for discussions of this definition and recent results. Let us note that in the commutative case (i.e., in the classical statistical mechanics and probability theory) both definitions coincide. In addition, entanglement entropy for both definitions possesses the important property $S_\Lambda = S_{D\setminus\Lambda}$. For the first definition it is a direct consequence of the Schmidt decomposition of hermitian matrices [7]. For the second (algebraic) definition in the free fermion case considered in this paper, this property follows from formulas (2.25), (2.28) and (4.21) below.

Performing a fairly standard second quantization computation (see e.g. [2, 9, 34] for details and references), one verifies that the entanglement entropy, corresponding to the block Λ of the free fermion system that occupies a domain $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, is given by

$$S_\Lambda^\mathcal{D} = \mathrm{Tr}\ h(P_\Lambda^\mathcal{D}), \tag{2.6}$$

where

$$h(t) = -t\log_2 t - (1-t)\log_2(1-t),\ t \in [0,1] \tag{2.7}$$

is a binary Shannon entropy,

$$P_\Lambda^\mathcal{D} = \chi_\Lambda P^\mathcal{D} \chi_\Lambda \tag{2.8}$$

and $P^\mathcal{D}$ is the Fermi projection of the restriction $H_\mathcal{D} = \chi_\mathcal{D} H \chi_\mathcal{D}$ of the Schrödinger operator H given in (2.3) to $\mathcal{D}$[1]. Here and below we treat the indicator χ_Λ of Λ as the orthogonal projection from $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ to $\ell^2(\Lambda)$, thus $P_\Lambda^\mathcal{D} = \chi_\Lambda P^\mathcal{D}\chi_\Lambda$ is the restriction of $P^\mathcal{D}$ to Λ. We recall that the Fermi projection Q_μ of the self-adjoint operator K is its spectral projection-valued measure $\mathcal{E}_K$, corresponding to the interval $(-\infty, \mu]$, i.e., $Q_\mu = \mathcal{E}_K((-\infty,\mu]) = \chi_{(-\infty,\mu]}(K)$ and μ is the Fermi energy.

We also note that for a Hermitian operator K on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, $f(K)$ is defined by means of its spectral decomposition.

[1]It is important to recognize that $P^\mathcal{D}$ neither coincides with $\chi_\mathcal{D} P \chi_\mathcal{D}$ (where P is given in (2.9)) nor is $P_\Lambda^\mathcal{D}$ is equal to P_Λ, since H is not a multiplication operator.

It is easy to show that $H_{\mathcal{D}}$ converges strongly to H as $\mathcal{D} \nearrow \mathbb{Z}^d$, say in the van Hove sense [36], hence $P^{\mathcal{D}}$ converges strongly to the Fermi projection

$$P = \mathcal{E}_H((-\infty, \mu]) \tag{2.9}$$

of H provided that μ is not its eigenvalue. Since Λ is a finite set, $S_\Lambda^{\mathcal{D}}$ of (2.6) converges to

$$S_\Lambda = \operatorname{Tr} h(P_\Lambda), \tag{2.10}$$

where (cf. (2.8))

$$P_\Lambda = \chi_\Lambda P \chi_\Lambda \tag{2.11}$$

is the restriction of P of (2.9) to Λ.

We will assume in this paper that the potential (2.5) is an ergodic field in $\mathbb{Z}^d$. Recall that the field is defined by a measurable function $v : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ endowed with a measure preserving and ergodic group of transformations $\{T_a\}_{a\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ [24]:

$$V(\omega) = \{V(x,\omega)\}_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d},\ V(x,\omega) = v(T_x\omega),\ x \in \mathbb{Z}^d,\ \omega \in \Omega \tag{2.12}$$

or

$$V(x, T_a\omega) = V(x + a, w),\ v(\omega) = V(0,\omega),\ a, x \in \mathbb{Z}^d,\ \omega \in \Omega. \tag{2.13}$$

As a result, the whole operator defined by (2.3) and (2.12) – (2.13)

$$H(\omega) = -\Delta + V(\omega) = \{H(x, y, \omega)\}_{x,y\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \tag{2.14}$$

is an ergodic operator (see [32]), i.e., satisfies the relation

$$H(x, y, T_a\omega) = H(x + a, y + a, \omega),\ a, x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d,\ \ \omega \in \Omega. \tag{2.15}$$

A particular case of the ergodic Schrödinger operator whose potential is a collection of i.i.d. random variables is known as the Anderson model. More generally, a random operator $A(\omega) = \{A(x, y, \omega)\}_{x,y\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ is called ergodic if it satisfies (2.15).

It then follows (see [32], Theorem 2.7) that the Fermi projection (2.9) is an ergodic orthogonal projection $P(\omega)$, i.e., it is selfadjoint, $P^2(\omega) = P(\omega)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} P(\omega) &= \{P(x, y, \omega)\}_{x,y\in\mathbb{Z}^d},\ \omega \in \Omega. \\ P(x, y, T_a\omega) &= P(x + a, y + a, \omega),\ a, x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d,\ \omega \in \Omega. \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

In particular, for any collection $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{j=1}^k$ of points in $\mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{Z}^d$ we have:

$$\mathbf{E}\Big\{\prod_{i=1}^k P(x_i, y_i)\Big\} = \mathbf{E}\Big\{\prod_{i=1}^k P(x_i + a, y_i + a)\Big\}, \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{Z}^d. \tag{2.17}$$

Here and below the symbol $\mathbf{E}\{\ldots\}$ denotes the expectation in the above probability space and we omit the event variable $\omega \in \Omega$ in expectations.

We will also denote by $\{e_n\}_{n=1}^d$ the standard basis of $\mathbb{Z}^d$. It will be convenient to use the maximum norm $\|x\|_\infty = \max(|x_1|, \ldots, |x_d|)$ for a vector $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. It induces the distance

$$\operatorname{dist}(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2) = \min_{x\in\mathcal{C}_1, y\in\mathcal{C}_2} \|x - y\|_\infty \tag{2.18}$$

and the boundary of $\mathcal{C}$, which is defined by

$$\partial\mathcal{C} = \left\{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d :\ \operatorname{dist}(x, \mathcal{C}^c) = 1\right\}. \tag{2.19}$$

We will confine ourselves to the case where the block Λ in (2.6) – (2.10) is a d-dimensional lattice cube

$$\Lambda_M = [-M, M]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d, \ |\Lambda| = L^d, \ L = 2M + 1, \tag{2.20}$$

where M is a positive integer. Note that $\Lambda_M = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \ \|x\|_\infty \leq M\}$.

A basic ingredient in proofs of our results below is the exponential decay of the off diagonal matrix elements of the Fermi projection given in (2.9) and (2.16), if the Fermi energy μ lies in the exponentially localized part of the spectrum of $H(\omega)$. This is a central result in the spectral theory of Schrödinger operators with ergodic potential. Concretely, it states that for such μ there exist $C_0 < \infty$ and $\gamma > 0$ such that

$$\mathbf{E}\{|P(x, y)|\} \leq C_0 e^{-\gamma|x-y|}, \tag{2.21}$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. The bound is a manifestation of the exponential localization for the Schrödinger operator in the neighborhood of μ, i.e., the pure point spectrum with exponentially decaying eigenfunctions.

Let us list some of the well known cases in which the validity of (2.21) is established for the discrete ergodic Schrödinger operator $H(\omega)$ given by (2.14):

(a) For i.i.d. random potentials, any $d \geq 1$ and any μ in the spectrum of $H(\omega)$ if the amplitude of the potential (see e.g. (4.36)) is large enough and its probability distribution F is regular enough (see (2.45) for the precise definition of the required regularity).

(b) For i.i.d. random potentials, any $d \geq 1$ and μ sufficiently close to the spectrum edges of $H(\omega)$ if the amplitude of the potential is fixed and F is regular enough. In particular, in this case the intervals of exponential localization could coexist with intervals of extended states below or above the exponentially localized part of spectrum, which contains μ.

(c) For i.i.d. random potentials, $d = 1$, any μ in the spectrum of $H(\omega)$, any F that is not concentrated at a single point and any amplitude of the random potential.

(d) For an interesting and widely studied case of a non-random ergodic (quasiperiodic) potential, where $V(x, \omega) = 2g \cos 2\pi(\alpha x + \omega), \ x \in \mathbb{Z}, \ \omega \in [0, 1)$, with Diophantine α and $g > 1$ (the supercritical almost Mathieu operator with Diophantine frequency).

In brief, the cases (a) – (b) and (d) describe the exponential localization either at high disorder or at extreme energies for a $d \geq 1$ dimensional ergodic Schrödinger operator. Let us mention that the bound (2.21) extends to a broader class of random operators with a more general than the discrete Laplacian (2.4) "hopping" part and/or with correlated random potentials. The bound is closely related to the analogous bound (4.41) for the fractional moments of the Green function of corresponding operator. It is also worth noting that (at least for i.i.d. potentials) the validity of (2.21) requires the exponential localization (e.g. (4.41)) only in a neighborhood of the Fermi energy μ but not in the whole halfline $(-\infty, \mu]$. The corresponding physical intuition is that at zero temperature only states close to the Fermi energy determine the properties of the free Fermi gas and the corresponding mathematical proof (at least for i.i.d. potentials) is based on the exponential decay (4.41) of the Green function's fractional moments of the operator in question. We refer the reader to the works [3, 4, 6, 15, 21, 29, 42] for results and references on various aspects of the validity and applications of the bound.

Although the operator $P(\omega)$ introduced in (2.9) is the Fermi projection of the ergodic Schrödinger operator $H(\omega)$ given by (2.14), a considerable amount of our results can be formulated and proved independently of the origin of $P(\omega)$. In particular, the results concerning

the mean entanglement entropy (see Results 2 – 3) are valid for *any* ergodic orthogonal projection satisfying (2.16) and (2.21) (cf. Assumption 3.2). For instance, it can be the spectral projection of H

$$P(\omega) = \mathcal{E}_{H(\omega)}(I) \tag{2.22}$$

where I is a subset of the spectrum of $H(\omega)$ for which the exponential bound (2.21) holds.

Given an orthogonal projection $P = \{P(x,y)\}_{x,y\in\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)}$ and the sets $\mathcal{C}_1 \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\mathcal{C}_2 \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, consider the self-adjoint operator acting on $\ell^2(\mathcal{C}_1)$

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2} := \chi_{\mathcal{C}_1} P \chi_{\mathcal{C}_2} P \chi_{\mathcal{C}_1} = \{\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2}(x,y)\}_{x,y\in\mathcal{C}_1}\,; \tag{2.23}$$

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2}(x,y) = \sum_{z\in\mathcal{C}_2} P(x,z)P(z,y), \tag{2.24}$$

see Lemma 4.3 for its properties. We will often deal with a case $\mathcal{C}_2 = {\mathcal{C}_1}^c$ (with $\mathcal{C}^c = \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \mathcal{C}$), where we will use the shorthand notation

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{C}} = \Pi_{\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}^c}. \tag{2.25}$$

We will also use the following change of variables for the function h of (2.7):

$$h(t) = h_0(t(1-t)),\ t \in [0,1]. \tag{2.26}$$

This relation defines $h_0 : [0,1/4] \to\ [0,1]$ implicitly; its explicit definition of and necessary properties are given in Lemma 4.1.

It follows then from (2.25) that if P_Λ is defined in (2.11), then

$$P_\Lambda(\chi_\Lambda - P_\Lambda) = \Pi_\Lambda \tag{2.27}$$

and (2.10) and (2.26) imply

$$S_\Lambda = \operatorname{Tr} h_0(\Pi_\Lambda). \tag{2.28}$$

We remark that the right hand side is well defined in view of Lemma 4.1 (ii).

2.2 Results

We start with a simple general observation asserting that the large block behavior of the entanglement entropy of the ergodic system is intrinsically different from that of the thermodynamic entropy, which is extensive, i.e., asymptotically proportional to the volume L^d of the block Λ_M defined in (2.20) [31, 36]. In addition, the proof of the assertion shows the advantage of using the formula (2.28) rather than (2.10), since the former explicitly takes into account the fact that the main contribution to S_{Λ_M} comes from a sufficiently thick layer adjacent to the surface of Λ_M - a fact that is systematically used below. This can be seen from the decay of the matrix elements of the operator Π_Λ (see (2.25) with $\mathcal{C} = \Lambda$) away from the boundary of Λ.

Here we will use only the slow decay of $P(x,y)$ required by the equality

$$\sum_{y\in\mathbb{Z}^d} |P(x,y)|^2 = P(x,x) \le 1, \tag{2.29}$$

which is valid for any orthogonal projection in $\ell^2\left(\mathbb{Z}^d\right)$. In subsequent assertions, we will use the exponential bound (2.21), which will allow us to establish a variety of asymptotic properties of S_Λ as the size of Λ tends to infinity.

Result 1 *Let $S_\Lambda(\omega)$ be the entanglement entropy* (2.10) *of disordered free lattice fermions whose one body Hamiltonian is a discrete ergodic Schrödinger operator $H(\omega)$ defined in* (2.14) *and* (2.12) – (2.13) *and let $P(\omega)$ be its Fermi projection defined in* (2.9) *and* (2.16) – (2.17). *Then, for $\Lambda = \Lambda_M := [-M, M]^d \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, $L = 2M + 1$, we have:*

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} L^{-d}\mathbf{E}\{S_{\Lambda_M}\} = 0. \tag{2.30}$$

Proof. The assertion is a special case of Theorem 3.4 (with the choice $f = h_0$ there), proven in the next section. This can be seen from (2.7), (2.26), (2.28) and Lemma 4.1 (v), which implies that h_0 satisfies Condition 3.1 for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. ■

To present in a compact form our results on the area law in the mean, we will assume certain symmetry properties of the ergodic potential given in (2.3), (2.5) and (2.12) – (2.13) (the general case is described in Remark 2.1).

Assume that in addition to the ergodic group $\{T_a\}_{a\in\mathbb{Z}}$ introduced in (2.12) – (2.16), the probability space is endowed with the measure preserving transformation R (reflection) such that

$$V(x, R\omega) = V(-x, \omega), \quad x \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \quad \omega \in \Omega. \tag{2.31}$$

For instance, this is the case for any random i.i.d. potential in any dimension as well as for quasiperiodic potentials $V(x, \omega) = v(\alpha x + \omega)$, $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\omega \in [0, 1)$, where $v : [0, 1) \to \mathbb{R}$ is an even 1-periodic function, α is an irrational number and ω is uniformly distributed over the one-dimensional torus $[0, 1)$.

Assume also that there exists a collection of measure preserving transformations $\{\Sigma_\sigma\}_{\sigma\in S_d}$ (permutations) of the probability space that forms a representation of the symmetric group S_d on d symbols and such that

$$V(x, \Sigma_\sigma\omega) = V(\sigma x, \omega), \ x \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \ \sigma \in S_d, \ \omega \in \Omega. \tag{2.32}$$

This property is valid in the case of i.i.d. potential in any dimension.

Since the d-dimensional discrete Laplacian commutes with the reflection $x \to -x$ and permutations of the components $x = (x_1, ..., x_d) \to \sigma x = (x_{\sigma(1)}, ..., x_{\sigma(d)})$ of vectors in $\mathbb{Z}^d$, the Schrödinger operator (2.14) and consequently its Fermi projection (2.9) also possesses these properties (see Theorem 2.7 of [32]):

$$P(x, y, R\omega) = P(-x, -y, \omega), \ x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \ \omega \in \Omega \tag{2.33}$$

and

$$P(x, y, \Sigma_\sigma\omega) = P(\sigma x, \sigma y, \omega), \ x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \ \omega \in \Omega. \tag{2.34}$$

To formulate our second assertion, we introduce the following notation:

$$\mathbb{Z}_\pm = [0, \pm\infty) \cap \mathbb{Z}, \quad \mathbb{Z}^d_\pm = \mathbb{Z}_\pm \times \mathbb{Z}^{d-1}. \tag{2.35}$$

We also remind the reader that $\{e_n\}_{n=1}^d$ stands for the standard basis of $\mathbb{Z}^d$.

Result 2 *Let $S_\Lambda(\omega)$ be the entanglement entropy* (2.10) *of disordered free lattice fermions whose one body Hamiltonian is a discrete ergodic Schrödinger operator $H(\omega)$ defined in* (2.14) *and* (2.12) – (2.13) *and let $P(\omega)$ be its Fermi projection defined in* (2.9), (2.16) – (2.17) *and* (2.33) – (2.34). *Assume that the Fermi energy μ lies in the exponentially localized part of the spectrum of $H(\omega)$, i.e., the bound* (2.21) *holds. Then, for $\Lambda = \Lambda_M := [-M, M]^d \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, $L = 2M + 1$ and $B(je_1, je_1) = \langle\delta_{je_1}, B\delta_{je_1}\rangle$, we have:*

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} L^{-(d-1)}\mathbf{E}\{S_{\Lambda_M}\} = 2d \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \mathbf{E}\{(h(P_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+}))(je_1, je_1)\} < \infty, \tag{2.36}$$

where $P_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+}(\omega) = \chi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+} P(\omega)\chi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+}$.

Proof. The assertion is a special case of Theorem 3.5 (with the choice $f = h_0$ there), proven in the next section. This can be seen from (2.7), (2.26), (2.28) and Lemma 4.1 (v), which implies that h_0 satisfies Condition 3.1 for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

Note that the Fermi projection satisfies the bound (2.21) under the conditions given in items (a) – (d) of the list below (2.21) and the text below the list. ∎

Remark 2.1 We will present here the general form of Result 2 where we do not assume the symmetry properties (2.33) – (2.34) of the underlying ergodic projection. Denote

$$\mathbb{Z}^d_s(j) = \{x = (x_1, ..., x_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d : sx_j \geq 0\},\ s = \pm.$$

Then instead of (2.36) we have

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} L^{-(d-1)}\mathbf{E}\{S_{\Lambda_M}\} = \sum_{j=1}^{d}\sum_{s=\pm}\sum_{x_j\in\mathbb{Z}^d_s(j)} \mathbf{E}\{(h(P_{\mathbb{Z}^d_s(j)}))(x_je_j, x_je_j)\}. \tag{2.37}$$

In particular, in the one dimensional case, one has

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} \mathbf{E}\{S_{\Lambda_M}\} = \mathbf{E}\left\{\mathrm{Tr}\, h\left(P_{\mathbb{Z}_-}\right)\right\} + \mathbf{E}\left\{\mathrm{Tr}\, h\left(P_{\mathbb{Z}_+}\right)\right\}, \tag{2.38}$$

with $\mathbb{Z}_\pm$ defined in (2.35).

Remark 2.2 It is interesting to compare the above results with those in the translation invariant case, where the operator A in (2.1) is a convolution operator in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$:

$$A = \{A(x - y)\}_{x,y\in\mathbb{Z}^d},\ \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} |A(x)| < \infty. \tag{2.39}$$

In this case, for $d = 1$, the Fermi projection (2.9) is

$$P(x, y) = \frac{\sin p(\mu)(x - y)}{\pi\,(x - y)}, \tag{2.40}$$

where $p(\mu) \in [0, \pi]$ is the Fermi momentum, determined by the Fourier transform (symbol) of $\{A(x)\}_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ (cf. (2.9) and (2.22)). It follows then from (2.10), Lemma 4.1 (iv) and (2.40) that for $d = 1$ we have

$$S_{\Lambda_M} \geq 4 \sum_{|x|\leq M, |y|>M} |P(x, y)|^2 = \frac{4}{\pi^2}\log L + O(1),\ L \to \infty. \tag{2.41}$$

A similar argument for $d > 1$ yields

$$S_{\Lambda_M} \geq C_d L^{d-1}\log L + O(L^{d-1}),\ L \to \infty. \tag{2.42}$$

The bounds (2.41) – (2.42) provide a simple manifestation of logarithmic corrections to the area law in translation invariant macroscopic systems [12, 14, 16, 19, 26, 40, 43]. Moreover, these bounds emphasize the difference between the translation invariant and disordered cases.

In the one dimensional case, it is possible not only to prove the existence of the limit of the mean entanglement entropy, i.e., to find the leading term of the asymptotics of the mean entanglement entropy as $L \to \infty$, but also to find the leading term for all typical realizations, i.e., with probability 1. This can be viewed as the one dimensional version of the area law for typical realizations.

Result 3 *Let $S_\Lambda(\omega)$ be the entanglement entropy* (2.10) *of disordered free lattice fermions in dimension 1 whose one body Hamiltonian is a discrete ergodic Schrödinger operator $H(\omega)$ defined in* (2.14) *and* (2.12) – (2.13) *and let $P(\omega)$ be its Fermi projection defined in* (2.9) *and* (2.16) – (2.17). *Assume that the Fermi energy μ lies in the exponentially localized part of the spectrum of $H(\omega)$, i.e., the bound* (2.21) *holds. Then, for $\Lambda = \Lambda_M := [-M, M] \subset \mathbb{Z}$, $L = 2M + 1$, we have, with probability 1:*

$$S_\Lambda(\omega) = S_+(T_M\omega) + S_-(T_{-M}\omega) + o(1),\ L := (2M+1) \to \infty, \tag{2.43}$$

where

$$S_\pm(\omega) = \mathrm{Tr}\ h(P_{\mathbb{Z}_\mp}(\omega)), \quad P_{\mathbb{Z}_\pm}(\omega) = \chi_{\mathbb{Z}_\pm} P(\omega) \chi_{\mathbb{Z}_\pm}, \tag{2.44}$$

$\mathbb{Z}_\pm$ is defined in (2.35) *and the shift ergodic transformations $T_{\pm M}$ are defined in* (2.12) – (2.16).

The random variables (2.44) are finite and not zero if the Fermi energy μ in (2.9) – (2.10) lies strictly inside the spectrum (equivalently, if P is neither the zero operator nor the identity operator).

Proof. The assertions on the existence of a well-defined (i.e., finite with probability 1) asymptotics (2.43) – (2.44) follow from those of Theorem 3.6 (with the choice $f = h_0$ there). This can be seen from (2.7), (2.26), (2.28) and Lemma 4.1 (v) which implies that h_0 satisfies Condition 3.1 for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

Let us prove that the random variables (2.44) are not zero with probability 1. Indeed, assume that $S_+(\omega) = 0$ with probability 1 (the case $S_-(\omega) = 0$ can be considered analogously). It follows from (2.44), (2.26), (2.28) and Lemma 4.1 (ii) that $\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}_+}(\omega) = 0$, with probability 1. Now, taking into account (2.23) – (2.24) and the fact that $P(\omega)$ is hermitian and ergodic, we obtain that $P(x, y, \omega) = 0$ for $x \neq y$ with probability 1, i.e., that the projection $P(\omega)$ is diagonal: $P(x, y, \omega) = P(x, x, \omega)\delta_{xy}$. Since $P(\omega)$ commutes with the Schrödinger operator (2.14), we have $P(x, x, \omega) = P(x + 1, x + 1, \omega)$, $\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}$, i.e., $P(\omega) = p(\omega)\mathbf{1}_\mathbb{Z}$, where $p(\omega) \in \{0, 1\}$ and $p(\omega) = p(T_a\omega)$, $\forall a \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since the group $\{T_a\}_{a\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is ergodic, i.e., has no invariant subsets in Ω except $\emptyset$ and Ω, p is independent of ω. Thus, $P(\omega)$ is either the zero operator or the identity operator, contrary to our assumption that P is a non-trivial projection.

Note that the Fermi projection satisfies the bound (2.21) under the conditions given in items (a) – (d) of the list below (2.21) and the text below the list. ■

Note that the most studied class of operators for which (2.21) holds consists of Schrödinger operators with i.i.d. potential or more generally, potentials with sufficiently fast decay of statistical correlations, see [6, 15, 42] and the items (a) – (c) of the list after formula (2.21). However, the bound (2.21) also holds for one dimensional Schrödinger operators with quasiperiodic potentials (see, e.g., [21] and the item (d) of the list after (2.21)), which have, so to speak, a minimal amount of randomness. This shows that the hypotheses of Results 2 and 3 above can be satisfied even for systems where statistical correlations of the associated ergodic potential do not exhibit fast decay. Our next assertion on the power law decay (in L) of the variance of the entanglement entropy per unit area for $d \geq 2$, however, does rely on independence of random potentials in the corresponding discrete Schrödinger operator (Anderson model).

Result 4 *Let $S_\Lambda(\omega)$ be the entanglement entropy* (2.10) *of disordered free lattice fermions whose one body Hamiltonian is a discrete ergodic Schrödinger operator $H(\omega)$ defined in* (2.14) *and* (2.12) – (2.13) *and let $P(\omega)$ be its Fermi projection defined* (2.9) *and* (2.16) – (2.17).

Assume that the potential in $H(\omega)$ is a collection of i.i.d. random variables such that their common probability distribution F is uniformly Hölder continuous:

$$F((v-\varepsilon, v+\varepsilon)) \leq C|\varepsilon|^{\tau},\ \forall v \in \operatorname{supp} F,\ \varepsilon > 0,\ \tau \in (0,1], \tag{2.45}$$

where C is independent of v. Assume also that the Fermi energy μ lies in the exponentially localized part of the spectrum of $H(\omega)$, i.e., the bound (2.21) *holds. Then, for $\Lambda = \Lambda_M := [-M, M]^d \subset \mathbb{Z}^d,\ L = 2M+1$, we have:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Var}\left\{L^{-(d-1)}\, S_{\Lambda_M}\right\} := \mathbf{E}\left\{\left(L^{-(d-1)}\, S_{\Lambda_M}\right)^2\right\} - \left(\mathbf{E}\left\{L^{-(d-1)}\, S_{\Lambda_M}\right\}\right)^2 \\ \leq C\,(\log L)^{4d/(d+1)}\, L^{-2(d-1)/(d+1)},\ \ L \to \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{2.46}$$

Proof. The assertion is a corollary of Theorem 3.7 with the choice $f = h_0$ there and Lemma 4.11. This can be seen from (2.7), (2.26), (2.28) and Lemma 4.1 (v) which implies that h_0 satisfies Condition 3.1 for any $\alpha \in (0,1)$. ■

Note that the Fermi projection satisfies the bound (2.21) under the conditions given in items (a) – (c) of the list below (2.21) and the text below the list.

3 Proofs

In this section we prove several assertions that are more general versions of Results 1 - 4 of the previous section. They are valid for a certain class of functions that includes the function h described in (2.7) and for a class of ergodic operators that includes a Schrödinger operator with an ergodic potential. Namely, the assertions of this section focus on the large block behavior of the quantity

$$F_\Lambda(\omega) = \operatorname{Tr} f\left(\Pi_\Lambda(\omega)\right) \tag{3.1}$$

where $\Pi_\Lambda((\omega))$ is defined in (2.25), (2.27) and Assumption 3.2 below and f satisfies

Condition 3.1 *The function f is supported on $[0, 1/4]$ and $f \in C^2(0, 1/4]$. Moreover, there exists $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ such that*

$$\max_{k\in\{0,1,2\}} \sup_{x\neq 0} \left|f^{(k)}(x)\right| |x|^{k-\alpha} < \infty.$$

Note that the right hand side in (3.1) is well defined in view Lemma 4.3 (ii).

For a function f satisfying Condition 3.1, the bound

$$|f(x)| \leq C\,|x|^{\alpha} \tag{3.2}$$

holds uniformly for all $x \in [0, 1/4]$.

We remark that the function h_0 of (2.26) belongs to this class for any $\alpha \in (0,1)$, see Lemma 4.1 (v). Thus, the entanglement entropy (2.28) is a particular case of (3.1) – (3.2).

We will also consider a more general class of ergodic orthogonal projections. Namely, we will not assume below that the orthogonal projection in (2.25) and (2.28) is the Fermi projection (2.9) (or the spectral projection (2.22)) of a Schrödinger operator (2.14) with an ergodic potential. Instead we will require the following properties of projections.

Assumption 3.2 *The orthogonal projection $P(\omega)$ is ergodic (i.e., satisfies* (2.16) – (2.17)*) and*

$$\mathbf{E}\{|P(x,y)|\} \leq C\mathrm{e}^{-\gamma|x-y|}, \quad \forall\ x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d,\ \gamma > 0,\ C < \infty. \tag{3.3}$$

This assumption is satisfied for the Fermi projection (2.9) of the Schrödinger operator (2.14) with ergodic potential (2.12) – (2.13) in situations described in the items (a) – (d) of the list below (2.21).

The i.i.d. randomness requirement needed for Result 4 is now replaced by

Assumption 3.3 *Suppose that $P(\omega)$ is an ergodic orthogonal projection satisfying Assumption 3.2 and, in addition, that for any finite $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ there exists a random orthogonal projection $\widehat{P}_\Lambda(\omega) = \{\widehat{P}_\Lambda(x,y,\omega)\}_{x,y\in\Lambda}$ in $\ell^2(\Lambda)$ with the following properties:*

(i) Proximity to $P(\omega)$ away from the boundary of Λ:

$$\mathbf{E}\Big\{ \Big| P(x,y) - \widehat{P}_\Lambda(x,y) \Big| \Big\} \leq C\, |\partial\Lambda|\, \mathrm{e}^{-\widetilde{\gamma} R},\ \widetilde{\gamma} > 0,\ C < \infty \tag{3.4}$$

for any $(x,y) \in \Lambda \times \Lambda$ that satisfies

$$\mathrm{dist}\,(\{x\}, \partial\Lambda) + \mathrm{dist}\,(\{y\}, \partial\Lambda) \geq R, \tag{3.5}$$

see (2.18) – (2.19) for the notation;

(ii) Statistical independence: For $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{L} \subset \Lambda$ consider a rigid motion (i.e., a composition of translation and rotation in $\mathbb{Z}^d$) g that takes Λ to Λ_g, $\mathcal{K}$ to $\mathcal{K}_g$, and $\mathcal{L}$ to $\mathcal{L}_g$. Then the random variables

$$\xi(\omega) = \mathrm{Tr}\, f\left(\chi_{\mathcal{K}} \widehat{P}_\Lambda(\omega) \chi_{\mathcal{L}} \widehat{P}_\Lambda(\omega) \chi_{\mathcal{K}}\right), \quad \xi_g(\omega) = \mathrm{Tr}\, f\left(\chi_{\mathcal{K}_g} \widehat{P}_{\Lambda_g}(\omega) \chi_{\mathcal{L}_g} \widehat{P}_{\Lambda_g}(\omega) \chi_{\mathcal{K}_g}\right) \tag{3.6}$$

are independent and identically distributed, as long as $\Lambda \cap \Lambda_g = \emptyset$.

In Lemma 4.11 we show that the conditions of Assumption 3.3 are met for the discrete Schrödinger operator (2.3) with an i.i.d. potential (Anderson model). In this case $\widehat{P}_\Lambda$ is the Fermi projection for the restriction $H_\Lambda(\omega)$ of $H(\omega)$ to Λ.

We remark that for all but one results in this section, we will use only Assumption 3.2.

Theorem 3.4 *Let $F_\Lambda(\omega)$ be defined by (3.1) and (2.23) – (2.25), where f satisfies Condition 3.1 and $P(\omega)$ is an ergodic projection (see (2.16) – (2.17)). Then, for $\Lambda = \Lambda_M := [-M, M]^d \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, $L = 2M + 1$, we have:*

$$\lim_{L\to\infty} L^{-d}\, \mathbf{E}\, \{|F_{\Lambda_M}|\} = 0.$$

Proof. Fix $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and set

$$u(R) = \mathbf{E}\Big\{ \sum_{y\in\mathbb{Z}^d:\ |x-y|\geq R} |P(x,y)|^2 \Big\}. \tag{3.7}$$

Clearly, u is monotone decreasing and is independent of x by ergodicity of $P(\omega)$, see (2.17). Moreover, we have from (2.29):

$$u(R) \leq 1, \quad \lim_{R\to\infty} u(R) = 0. \tag{3.8}$$

By (4.19) (with $m = 1$)

$$|f\,(\Pi_{\Lambda_M})\,(x,x,\omega)| \leq C\Big\{ \sum_{y\in\Lambda_M^c} |P(x,y,\omega)|^2 \Big\}^\alpha,$$

so using the Hölder inequality for expectations we get

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{\left|f\left(\Pi_{\Lambda_M}\right)(x,x)\right|\right\} \leq C\Big(\sum_{y\in\Lambda_M^c}\mathbf{E}\{|P(x,y)|^2\}\Big)^{\alpha}. \tag{3.9}$$

This and (3.1) imply

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{|F_{\Lambda_M}|\right\} \leq \sum_{x\in\Lambda_M}\mathbf{E}\left\{\left|f\left(\Pi_{\Lambda_M}\right)(x,x)\right|\right\} \leq C\sum_{x\in\Lambda_M}\Big(\sum_{y\in\Lambda_{M^c}}\mathbf{E}\{|P(x,y)|^2\}\Big)^{\alpha}.$$

Now, we choose a positive integer $\ell < M$ whose value we will set later and split the sum over $x \in \Lambda_M$ on the right hand side into $\Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2$, where Σ_1 is the sum over $x \in \Lambda_{M-\ell}$ and Σ_2 is the sum over $x \in \Lambda_M \setminus \Lambda_{M-\ell}$.

If $x \in \Lambda_{M-\ell}$, we have

$$\sum_{y\in\Lambda_M^c}\mathbf{E}\left\{|P(x,y)|^2\right\} \leq \sum_{y\in\mathbb{Z}^d:\ |x-y|\leq\ell}\mathbf{E}\left\{|P(x,y)|^2\right\},$$

so it follows from (3.7) that $\Sigma_1 \leq CL^d u^{\alpha}(\ell)$, for $\quad L = 2M+1$. On the other hand, in view of (2.29), the right hand side of (3.9) is bounded by C, so $\Sigma_2 \leq C\ell L^{d-1}$. Combining the two last bounds, we obtain

$$L^{-d}\,\mathbf{E}\left\{|F_{\Lambda_M}|\right\} \leq C(u^{\alpha}(\ell) + \ell/L).$$

The choice $\ell \to \infty,\ \ell = o(L)$ as $L \to \infty$ gives the desired result, thanks to (3.8). ■

Next, we prove that the limit of the ratio of the "generalized entanglement entropy" (3.1) to the surface area L^{d-1} of Λ_M exists and is finite. To avoid cumbersome formulas, we will again confine ourselves to the case of ergodic projections satisfying (2.33) – (2.34).

We will need the following collection of subsets of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ for $d \geq 2$. Let

$$\mathcal{F}_M^{(n)} = \begin{cases}\left\{x\in\Lambda_M:\ x\cdot e_n = M\right\}, & 1\leq n\leq d,\\ \left\{x\in\Lambda_M:\ x\cdot e_{|n|} = -M\right\} & -d\leq n\leq -1\end{cases} \tag{3.10}$$

be the faces of the cube Λ_M defined in (2.20). Fix $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and consider the truncation $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_M^{(n)}$ of $\mathcal{F}_M^{(n)}$, defined by removing points that are close to the edges of $\mathcal{F}_M^{(n)}$:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_M^{(n)} = \left\{x\in\mathcal{F}_M^{(n)} : \min_{k\neq n}\operatorname{dist}\left(x,\mathcal{F}_M^{(k)}\right)\geq 3\ell\right\}. \tag{3.11}$$

Furthermore, we define the surface layers $\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}$ in Λ_M to be the ℓ-neighborhoods of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_M^{(n)}$, for $n = \pm1, ..., \pm d$:

$$\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)} = \left\{x\in\Lambda_M:\ \operatorname{dist}\left(x,\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_M^{(n)}\right)<\ell\right\},\ n = \pm1,\pm2,..,\pm d. \tag{3.12}$$

By construction, we have

$$\operatorname{dist}\left(\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)},\mathcal{B}_M^{(k)}\right)\geq\ell \text{ for } n\neq k. \tag{3.13}$$

Note also that the sets $\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}$ are rectangular lattice prisms generated by rigid motion (i.e., by a collection of lattice translations and rotations) of the lattice prism

$$\mathcal{L}_{\ell,M} = \left([0,\ell)\times[-M+2\ell, M-2\ell]^{d-1}\right)\cap\mathbb{Z}^d. \tag{3.14}$$

For $d = 1$, we will use the following sets instead of those of above: $\mathcal{F}_M^{(\pm 1)} = \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_M^{(\pm 1)} = \{\pm M\}$ and

$$\mathcal{B}_M^{(\pm 1)} = [\pm M, \pm(M - \ell)]. \tag{3.15}$$

Notice that $\mathcal{B}_M^{(\pm 1)}$ are the translations of the lattice interval (cf. (3.14))

$$\mathcal{L}_\ell = [0, \ell] \cap \mathbb{Z}^d. \tag{3.16}$$

We will also need the lattice halfspaces $\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}$, for $n = \pm 1, ..., \pm d$, which are rigid motions of the lattice halfspace $\mathbb{Z}^d_+$ of (2.35) such that $\Lambda_M \subset \mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}$ and $\mathcal{F}^{(n)} \subset \partial\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}$. In particular, if we set

$$\mathbb{Z}^d_{\pm M} = (\mathbb{Z}_\mp \pm \{M\}) \times \mathbb{Z}^{d-1}, \tag{3.17}$$

then we have

$$\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,\pm 1} = \mathbb{Z}^d_{\pm M}. \tag{3.18}$$

In preparation for our next assertion, for any $M \in \mathbb{N}$, let us set

$$\ell = \begin{cases} [M/4] + 1 & \text{if } d = 1 \\ [c \ln M] & \text{if } d > 1 \end{cases}, \tag{3.19}$$

where $[x]$ denotes the integer part of x. We also define, for any $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{C}}(\omega) = \operatorname{Tr} \chi_{\mathcal{C}} f\left(\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+}(\omega)\right) \chi_{\mathcal{C}}. \tag{3.20}$$

Theorem 3.5 *Let $F_\Lambda(\omega)$ be defined by* (3.1) *and (2.23) – (2.25), where f satisfies Condition 3.1, $P(\omega)$ satisfies* (2.33) – (2.34) *and Assumption 3.2. We have, for $\Lambda = \Lambda_M := [-M, M]^d \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, $L = 2M + 1$*

(i) $d = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{L\to\infty} \mathbf{E}\left\{F_{\Lambda_M}\right\} &= 2 \lim_{L\to\infty} \mathbf{E}\left\{\Phi_{\mathcal{L}_\ell}\right\} \\ &= 2\,\mathbf{E}\left\{\operatorname{Tr} f\left(\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}_+}\right)\right\} < \infty, \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

where $\Phi_{\mathcal{L}_\ell}(\omega)$ is defined by (3.20) with $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{L}_\ell$, $\mathcal{L}_\ell$ is defined in (3.16) *and ℓ is defined in* (3.19)*;*

(ii) $d \geq 2$:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{L\to\infty} L^{-(d-1)}\,\mathbf{E}\left\{F_{\Lambda_M}\right\} &= 2d \lim_{L\to\infty} L^{-(d-1)}\,\mathbf{E}\left\{\Phi_{\mathcal{L}_{\ell,M}}\right\} \\ &= 2d \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \mathbf{E}\left\{f\left(\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+}\right)(je_1, je_1)\right\} < \infty, \end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

where $\Phi_{\mathcal{L}_{\ell,M}}(\omega)$ is defined by (3.20) with $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{L}_{\ell,M}$, $\mathcal{L}_{\ell,M}$ is defined in (3.14)*, e_1 is the first vector of the canonical basis $\{e_n\}_{n=1}^d$ of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ and ℓ is defined in* (3.19) *with c sufficiently large but M-independent.*

Proof. We note first that the properties (2.33) – (2.34) are assumed just to make the formulation of the theorem and its proof more transparent. In fact, the results of the theorem as well as its proof can be extended to the general case of projections, which satisfy only Assumption 3.2 but not (2.33) – (2.34). In this case the assertion of the theorem is

analogous to that in Remark 2.1, with h and S_{Λ_M} there replaced by f and F_{Λ_M}. The proof for this extension essentially coincides with the one given below, though it is more tedious.

We start with the proof of the second equality in (3.22) (the proof of the second equality in (3.21) is analogous). Let T_a be the measure preserving shift transformation (see (2.12) – (2.16)) by a vector $a \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. As usual, we will denote by $A(x,y)$ the matrix elements for the operator A on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, and will write $A(x,y;\omega)$ whenever we want to stress the dependence of A on the random configuration $\omega \in \Omega$. If a is orthogonal to e_1 we have $T_a\mathbb{Z}^d_+ = \mathbb{Z}^d_+$, so for any pair $(x,y) \in \mathbb{Z}^d_+ \times \mathbb{Z}^d_+$ we have

$$\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+}(x,y;T_a\omega) = \Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+}(x+a,y+a;\omega) \tag{3.23}$$

for such a, with probability 1. It follows then from an extended version of Theorem 2.7 of [32] that the operator $f(\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+}(\omega))$ has the same property. In particular, since T_a is a measure preserving transformation of the event space, we obtain that $\mathbf{E}\{f(\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+})(x,y\}$ does not depend on $x - \langle x, e_1\rangle e_1$ and so,

$$L^{-(d-1)}\mathbf{E}\left\{\Phi_{\mathcal{L}_\ell}\right\} = L^{-(d-1)}\left(2M - 4\ell + 1\right)^{d-1} \sum_{0\le j\le \ell} \mathbf{E}\{f(\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+})(je_1, je_1)\}, \tag{3.24}$$

in view of (3.14). To verify the existence of the finite limit as $M \to \infty$ on the right hand side, we use Lemma 4.5 (i) with

$$\mathcal{C}_1 = \mathbb{Z}^d_+ = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \ \langle x, e_1\rangle \ge 0\},\ \mathcal{C}_2 = (\mathbb{Z}^d_+)^c = \mathbb{N}^d_- := \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \ \langle x, e_1\rangle \le -1\} \tag{3.25}$$

to get the bound

$$\mathbf{E}\{|f(\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+})(je_1, je_1)|\} \le Ce^{-\alpha\gamma j}, \quad j \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \tag{3.26}$$

The bound and (3.19) yield the second equality in (3.22). Besides, (3.26) implies the finiteness of the limits in (3.21) and (3.22).

To prove the first equality in (3.21) and (3.22) we note that by Lemma 4.5 (see Assumption 3.2 and (2.23) for the notation used), contributions to

$$\mathbf{E}\{F_{\Lambda_M}\} = \mathbf{E}\left\{\operatorname{Tr} f\left(\Pi_{\Lambda_M}\right)\right\} = \sum_{x\in\Lambda_M} \mathbf{E}\left\{f\left(\Pi_{\Lambda_M}\right)(x,x)\right\}$$

due to points $x \in \Lambda_M$ that lie away from its boundary decay exponentially in $\operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\Lambda_M)$. In dimensions higher than one, i.e., for (3.21), a closer inspection shows that we may neglect contribution associated with points near the boundary of Λ, as long as their number does not exceed $o\left(L^{d-1}\right),\ L \to \infty$. Indeed, the contributions of this order wash out once we take $\lim_{L\to\infty} L^{-(d-1)}\mathbf{E}\{F_{\Lambda_M}\}$. Thus, it is not surprising that in the limit $L \to \infty$ the resulting expression converges (up to a factor $2d$ originating from the number of faces in Λ_M) to that generated by $\mathbb{Z}^d_+$ rather than Λ_M, since locally the boundary of Λ_M looks indistinguishable from a hyperplane $\partial\mathbb{Z}^d_+$.

To implement this observation in the proof of the first equality in (3.21) and (3.22) we use Lemmas 4.7 – 4.9 to get the bound

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{\left|\operatorname{Tr} f\left(\Pi_{\Lambda_M}\right) - \sum_{n=-d}^{d} \operatorname{Tr} \chi_{\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_M} f\left(\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}}\right)\chi_{\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_M}\right|^2\right\} \le C\, R_d(M), \tag{3.27}$$

where $\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_M$ and $\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}$ are defined in (3.10) – (3.18) and

$$R_d(M) = \left(M^d e^{-\alpha\gamma\ell/2} + (d-1)\ell^2 M^{d-2}\right)^2. \tag{3.28}$$

In particular, for $d = 1$, we substitute ℓ of (3.19) into (3.15) to obtain

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{\left|\operatorname{Tr} f\left(\Pi_{\Lambda_M}\right) - \sum_{n=\pm 1} \operatorname{Tr} \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} f\left(\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}_{+,n}}\right) \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}}\right|^2\right\} \leq C\,\mathrm{e}^{-cM}, \quad c > 0. \tag{3.29}$$

By ergodicity and (2.33),

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{\operatorname{Tr} \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} f\left(\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}_{+,n}}\right) \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}}\right\}$$

does not depend on $n = \pm 1$ and coincides with $\mathbf{E}\left\{\Phi_{[0,[M/4]]}\right\}$. This and the second equality in (3.21) yield the first equality in (3.21).

To obtain the existence of the first limit in (3.22), we use (3.27), choosing ℓ in (3.12) as in (3.19) to balance out the two terms in (3.28). This leads to the second equality in (3.22), by the same argument as in the proof of (3.21). ■

The exponential decay in (3.29) will play an important role in the proof of our next assertion for $d = 1$.

Theorem 3.6 *Let $F_\Lambda(\omega)$ be defined by* (3.1) *and (2.23) – (2.25), where $d = 1$, f satisfies Condition 3.1, $P(\omega)$ satisfies Assumption 3.2 and $\Lambda = \Lambda_M := [-M, M] \subset \mathbb{Z}$. Set*

$$F_\pm(\omega) = \operatorname{Tr} f\left(P_{\mathbb{Z}_\mp}(\omega)\right), \tag{3.30}$$

where $P_{\mathbb{Z}_\pm}(\omega)$ are defined by (2.11) *with $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}_\pm$ and $\mathbb{Z}_\pm$ given by* (2.35). *Then $F_\pm(\omega)$ is finite with probability 1 and we have, with the same probability,*

$$F_{\Lambda_M}(\omega) = F_+\left(T_{+M}\omega\right) + F_-\left(T_{-M}\omega\right) + o(1),\ L = 2M + 1 \to \infty, \tag{3.31}$$

where $T_{\pm M}$ are the ergodic shift transformations (see (2.12) – (2.16)*).*

Proof. The starting point is the bound (3.29) obtained for $d = 1$, with ℓ given in (3.19) and $\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}$, for $n = \pm 1$, given by (3.15). Note that, in view of (3.18), we have

$$\mathbb{Z}_{+,1} = (-\infty, M] \cap \mathbb{Z}, \quad \mathbb{Z}_{+,-1} = [-M, \infty) \cap \mathbb{Z}$$

in this case. Denoting

$$F_M^-(\omega) = \operatorname{Tr} \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(1)}} f\left(\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}_{+,1}}(\omega)\right) \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(1)}}, \quad F_M^+(\omega) = \operatorname{Tr} \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(-1)}} f\left(\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}_{+,-1}}(\omega)\right) \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(-1)}}, \tag{3.32}$$

we can rewrite (3.29) as

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{\left|F_{\Lambda_M} - \left(F_M^+ + F_M^-\right)\right|^2\right\} \leq Ce^{-cM}, \quad C < \infty, \quad c > 0. \tag{3.33}$$

On the other hand, the expectation of all terms on the left of (3.33) are uniformly bounded in M according to (3.9), hence the terms are finite with probability 1. This and the Borel-Cantelli lemma yield the asymptotic relation

$$F_{\Lambda_M}(\omega) = F_M^+(\omega) + F_M^-(\omega) + o(1), \quad M \to \infty, \tag{3.34}$$

which is valid with probability 1.

Next, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_M^-(\omega) &= \sum_{x=M-[M/4]}^{M} f\left(\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}_{+,1}}\right)(x, x, (\omega)) \\ &= \sum_{x=-\infty}^{M} f\left(\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}_{+,1}}\right)(x, x, (\omega)) - \Delta_M = \operatorname{Tr} f\left(\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}_{+,1}}(\omega)\right) - \Delta_M(\omega), \end{aligned} \tag{3.35}$$

where

$$\Delta_M(\omega) = \sum_{x=-\infty}^{M-[M/4]-1} f\left(\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}_{+,1}}\right)(x,x,\omega).$$

According to Lemma 4.5 (i), $\mathbf{E}\{|\Delta_M|\} \le Ce^{-cM}$ with $C<\infty$, $c>0$. This and the Borel-Cantelli lemma yield the relation

$$\Delta_M(\omega) = o(1), \quad M\to\infty, \tag{3.36}$$

which is again valid with probability 1.

Note now that according to (2.25) and (2.27), $\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}_{+,1}}(\omega) = \chi_{\mathbb{Z}_{+,1}} P(\omega)\chi_{(\mathbb{Z}_{+,1})^c} P(\omega)\chi_{\mathbb{Z}_{+,1}}$. This and (2.16) yield

$$\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}_{+,1}}(\omega) = \Pi_{\mathbb{Z}_+}(T_M\omega),\ \omega\in\Omega,$$

where $\mathbb{Z}_-$ is defined in (2.35). Combining (3.35) – (3.36) and their counterparts for the second term in (3.34), we obtain (3.30) – (3.31). ■

Theorem 3.7 *Let $F_\Lambda(\omega)$ be defined by* (3.1) *and (2.23) – (2.25), where f satisfies Condition 3.1, $P(\omega)$ satisfies Assumption 3.2 and Assumption 3.3. Then, for $d\ge 2$ and $\Lambda_M = [-M,M]^d \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, $L=2M+1$, we have:*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{Var}\left\{L^{-(d-1)}F_{\Lambda_M}\right\} &:= \mathbf{E}\left\{\left(L^{-(d-1)}F_{\Lambda_M}\right)^2\right\} - \left(\mathbf{E}\left\{L^{-(d-1)}F_{\Lambda_M}\right\}\right)^2 \\ &\le C\,(\log M)^{4d/(d+1)}\, M^{-2(d-1)/(d+1)}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.37}$$

Proof. The idea of the proof is to bound the variance on the right of (3.37) by that of the sum $\sum_{j=1}^m \eta_j$ of certain i.i.d. random variables $\{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^m$ and use the relation

$$\mathbf{Var}\left\{\sum_{j=1}^m \eta_j\right\} = m\,\mathbf{Var}\{\eta_1\}. \tag{3.38}$$

The result will then follow from an appropriate choice for $m=m(M)$.

To this end we will systematically use the bound

$$\mathbf{Var}\{\xi_1\} \le 2\,\mathbf{Var}\{\xi_2\} + 2\mathbf{E}\left\{|\xi_1-\xi_2|^2\right\}, \tag{3.39}$$

which is valid for a pair of random variables (ξ_1,ξ_2).

Let $\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}$ be a rigid lattice motion of $\mathbb{Z}^d_+$ such that $\Lambda_M\subset\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}$ and $\mathcal{F}_M^{(n)}\subset\partial Z^d_{+,n}$. We will again use sets $\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}$ defined in (3.12), with ℓ as in (3.19) and $c>0$, which is large enough but independent of M. Using (3.39) with $\xi_1 = F_{\Lambda_M}$ of (3.1) and

$$\xi_2 = \sum_{n=-d}^{d} \mathrm{Tr}\,\chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} f\left(\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}}\right)\chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}},$$

we get that

$$\mathbf{Var}\{F_{\Lambda_M}\} \le 2\,\mathbf{Var}\{\xi_2\} + C(\log M)^4 M^{2(d-2)}, \tag{3.40}$$

in view of (3.27) and (3.28) with $d\ge 2$. Thus, the inequality

$$\mathbf{E}\Big\{\Big(\sum_j \eta_j\Big)\Big\}^2\Big\} \le \Big(\sum_j \Big(\mathbf{E}\Big\{\eta_j^2\Big\}\Big)^{1/2}\Big)^2, \tag{3.41}$$

which implies

$$\mathbf{Var}\Big\{ \Big(\sum_j \eta_j \Big)^2 \Big\} \le \Big(\sum_j \Big(\mathbf{E}\left\{ \eta_j^2 \right\} \Big)^{1/2} \Big)^2,$$

and properties (2.33) – (2.34) yield

$$\mathbf{Var}\{F_M\} \le 4d^2\, \mathbf{Var}\left\{\xi_3\right\} + C(\log M)^4 M^{2(d-2)}, \tag{3.42}$$

where

$$\xi_3 = \mathrm{Tr}\, \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(1)}} f\left(\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,1}} \right) \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(1)}}. \tag{3.43}$$

We introduce now the external surface layer $\mathcal{C}_M^{(1)}$, which is the reflection of $\mathcal{B}_M^{(1)}$ with respect to the face $\mathcal{F}_M^{(1)}$ of (3.10) without the points of the face, thus $\mathcal{B}_M^{(1)}$ belongs to our basic (closed) lattice cube $\Lambda_M = [-M, M]^d$ and $\mathcal{C}_M^{(1)}$ belongs to its exterior. We denote

$$\mathcal{L}_M^{(1)} = \mathcal{B}_M^{(1)} \cup \mathcal{C}_M^{(1)}. \tag{3.44}$$

This lattice set is a rigid lattice motion of (cf. (3.14))

$$\left([-\ell, \ell] \times [-M + 2\ell, M - 2\ell]^{d-1} \right) \cap\ Z^d. \tag{3.45}$$

Choose

$$\ell = [c \log M],\ m \ge M^{1/d}, \tag{3.46}$$

where $c > 0$ is large enough but independent of M (see (3.19)). Thinking of $\mathcal{L}_M^{(1)}$ as a set in $\mathbb{R}^d$ for just a moment, we partition it into m^{d-1} congruent rectangular prisms $\{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_k\}_{k=1}^{m^{d-1}}$, which are rigid motions of (cf. (3.14))

$$[-\ell, \ell] \times [-\tfrac{M-2\ell}{m}, \tfrac{M-2\ell}{m}]^{d-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{3.47}$$

Next, we introduce the lattice sets

$$\mathcal{L}_k = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_k \cap \mathbb{Z}^d,\ k = 1, ..., m^{d-1}.$$

Adjusting the value of m by 1 (if necessary) we can make sure that these sets are congruent and

$$\mathcal{L}_{k'} \cap \mathcal{L}_{k''} = \varnothing,\ k' \ne k''. \tag{3.48}$$

Let also

$$\mathcal{L}'_k = \mathcal{B}_M^{(1)} \cap \mathcal{L}_k,\ \mathcal{L}''_k = \mathcal{C}_M^{(1)} \cap \mathcal{L}_k \tag{3.49}$$

be the parts of $\mathcal{L}_k$ belonging to our basic cube $\Lambda_M = [-M, M]^d$ and its exterior respectively.

We will also need the lattice sets

$$\mathcal{K}_k = \{x \in \mathcal{L}_k :\ \mathrm{dist}\,(x, \partial\mathcal{L}_k) \ge \ell/4\},\ k = 1, ..., m^{d-1} \tag{3.50}$$

(the boundary $\partial\mathcal{C}$ for $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ is defined in (2.19)) and their parts

$$\mathcal{K}'_k = \mathcal{B}_M^{(1)} \cap \mathcal{K}_k,\ \mathcal{K}''_k = \mathcal{C}_M^{(1)} \cap \mathcal{K}_k, \tag{3.51}$$

belonging to $\Lambda_M = [-M, M]^d$ and its exterior respectively. Note that these sets are all separated by the "corridors" of width $\ell/2$ and that they are rigid motions of each other, for different values of k.

The volume of all the corridors between the $\mathcal{K}'_k$'s is given by

$$\left|\mathcal{B}_M^{(1)} \setminus \cup_{k=1}^{m^{d-1}} \mathcal{K}'_k\right| \leq Cm^{d-1}\ell^2(M/m)^{d-2} = Cm\ell^2 M^{d-2}.$$

Now, applying Lemma 4.5 (i) and (3.41), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}\left\{\left|\operatorname{Tr}\chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(1)}} f\left(\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,1}}\right)\chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(1)}} - \sum_k \operatorname{Tr}\chi_{\mathcal{K}'_k} f\left(\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}_{+,1}}\right)\chi_{\mathcal{K}'_k}\right|^2\right\} \\ \leq Cm^2(\log M)^4 M^{2(d-2)},\end{aligned} \tag{3.52}$$

in view of (3.46). Hence, if we denote

$$\xi_4 = \sum_{k=1}^{m^{d-1}} \operatorname{Tr}\chi_{\mathcal{K}'_k} f\left(\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,1}}\right)\chi_{\mathcal{K}'_k},$$

and use (3.39), (3.40) and (3.43), we deduce:

$$\mathbf{E}\{|\xi_3 - \xi_4|^2\} \leq 8d^2\,\mathbf{Var}\{\xi_4\} + Cm^2(\log M)^4 M^{2(d-2)}. \tag{3.53}$$

Setting now

$$\xi_5 = \sum_{k=1}^{m^{d-1}} \operatorname{Tr} f\left(\chi_{\mathcal{K}'_k}\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,1}}\chi_{\mathcal{K}'_k}\right) = \sum_{k=1}^{m^{d-1}} \operatorname{Tr} f\left(\Pi_{\mathcal{K}'_k,(\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,1})^c}\right)$$

(see (2.23) for the r.h.s. of the equality) and applying Lemma 4.9 to $\mathcal{K}'_k$ of (3.50) – (3.51) instead of $\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}$ of (3.12) and M/m instead M, we obtain

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{|\xi_4 - \xi_5|^2\right\} \leq C\,m^{d-1}R_d(M/m) \leq C\,m^2(\log M)^4 M^{2(d-2)}. \tag{3.54}$$

Next, if (see (3.49) – (3.51))

$$\xi_6 = \sum_{k=1}^{m^{d-1}} \operatorname{Tr} f\left(\Pi_{\mathcal{K}'_k,\mathcal{L}''_k}\right), \tag{3.55}$$

then we may apply (3.41), Lemma 4.4 and Lemma 4.3 (iv) to get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}\Big\{\,|\xi_5 - \xi_6|^2\,\Big\} &\leq \Big(\sum_{k=1}^{m^{d-1}}\Big(\mathbf{E}\Big\{\Big|\operatorname{Tr} f\Big(\Pi_{\mathcal{K}'_k,(\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,1})^c}\Big) - \operatorname{Tr} f\Big(\Pi_{\mathcal{K}'_k,\mathcal{L}''_k}\Big)\Big|^2\Big\}\Big)^{1/2}\Big)^2 \\ &\leq \Big(\sum_{k=1}^{m^{d-1}}\Big(\mathbf{E}\Big\{\Big\|\Pi_{\mathcal{K}'_k,(\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,1})^c\setminus\mathcal{L}''_k}\Big\|_\alpha^{2\alpha}\Big\}\Big)^{1/2}\Big)^2.\end{aligned}$$

By construction, we have $\operatorname{dist}(\mathcal{K}'_k, (\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,1})^c \setminus \mathcal{L}''_k) \geq \ell$, so according to Lemma 4.5(ii) (with $\mathcal{C}_1 = \mathcal{K}'_k$ and $\mathcal{C}_2 = (\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,1})^c \setminus \mathcal{L}''_k$) and (3.46), the r.h.s. is bounded by

$$C^{1/2}|\partial\mathcal{K}'_k|\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\gamma l/4}m^{d-1} \leq C_1((M/m)^{d-1} + \ell(M/m)^{d-2})\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\gamma l/4} = O(1),\ M\to\infty.$$

We obtain that

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{|\xi_5 - \xi_6|^2\right\} \leq C_2 M^{2(d-1)}\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\gamma\ell/4} = O(1),\ M\to\infty. \tag{3.56}$$

Finally, consider

$$\xi_7 = \sum_k \operatorname{Tr} f\left(\widehat{\Pi}_{\mathcal{K}'_k,\mathcal{L}''_k}\right),$$

where (see (2.23))

$$\widehat{\Pi}_{\mathcal{K}'_k,\,\mathcal{L}''_k} = \chi_{\mathcal{K}'_k}\widehat{P}_{\mathcal{L}_k}\chi_{\mathcal{L}''_k}\widehat{P}_{\mathcal{L}_k}\chi_{\mathcal{K}'_k}, \tag{3.57}$$

with $\widehat{P}_\Lambda$ defined in Assumption 3.3, i.e., $\widehat{\Pi}_{\mathcal{K}'_k,\mathcal{L}''_k}$ is an analog of $\Pi_{\mathcal{K}'_k,\mathcal{L}''_k}$ with P replaced by $\widehat{P}_{\mathcal{L}_k}$.

Since $\operatorname{dist}\left(\mathcal{K}'_k, \partial\mathcal{L}_k\right) \geq \ell/4$ (see (3.50) – (3.51)), we can apply Lemma 4.10 with $a = \ell/4$, $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{L}_k$ and $\mathcal{Q}_a = \mathcal{K}_k$ to obtain

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{|\xi_6 - \xi_7|^2\right\} \leq C\ |\partial\mathcal{L}_k|^5\, \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\tilde{\gamma}\ell} \leq C\,\ell^5 m^{-5(d-1)} M^{5(d-1)} \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\tilde{\gamma}\ell}.$$

In view of (3.46), we conclude that

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{|\xi_6 - \xi_7|^2\right\} = O(1),\ M \to \infty. \tag{3.58}$$

Finally, we note that the random variables $\left\{\operatorname{Tr} f\left(\widehat{\Pi}_{\mathcal{K}'_k,\mathcal{L}''_k}\right)\right\}_{k=1}^{m^{d-1}}$ are i.i.d. by Assumption 3.3 and (3.48), so we can apply (3.38) for this collection of random variables. In addition, it follows from straightforward modifications to Lemma 4.6 that

$$\mathbf{Var}\left\{\operatorname{Tr} f\left(\widehat{\Pi}_{\mathcal{K}'_k,\mathcal{L}''_k}\right)\right\} \leq C\ |\mathcal{K}_k|^2 \leq C_1\,(\log M)^2 (M/m)^{2(d-1)}.$$

This, bounds (3.42), (3.53), (3.54), (3.56), and (3.58) as well as the repeated use of (3.39) lead to the inequality

$$\mathbf{Var}\{F_{\Lambda_M}\} \leq C(\log M)^2 M^{2(d-1)}\left(m^{1-d} + m^2(\log M)^2 M^{-2}\right).$$

Now the assertion of theorem follows by choosing $m = (\log M)^{-2/(d+1)} M^{2/(d+1)}$ (cf. (3.46)) and taking into account the normalization factor $L^{-(d-1)}$ in (3.37). ■

4 Auxiliary results

We will start with several elementary assertions.

The first one is a bound on $\mathbf{E}\,|P(x,y)|^2$:

$$\mathbf{E}\{|P(x,y)|^2\} \leq \mathbf{E}\{|P(x,y)|\} \leq C\mathrm{e}^{-\gamma|x-y|}, \tag{4.1}$$

where we used (2.29) and Assumption 3.2.

Lemma 4.1 *Let $h : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ be defined in (2.7) and let*

$$h_0(t) = h\left(\frac{1-\sqrt{1-4t}}{2}\right), \quad t \in [0, \tfrac{1}{4}]. \tag{4.2}$$

Then

(i) h_0 is the function defined implicitly in (2.26);

(ii) $h_0(0) = 0$;

(iii) h_0 is nonnegative, monotone increasing and concave on $[0, \frac{1}{4}]$;

(iv) $4t \leq h_0(t)$ for $t \in [0, \frac{1}{4}]$;

(v) For any $\alpha \in (0,1)$, the function h_0 satisfies

$$\max_{k\in\{0,1,2\}} \sup_{\in[0,1/4]} \left|h_0^{(k)}(t)\right| |t|^{k-\alpha} < \infty. \tag{4.3}$$

Proof. (i) and (ii) can be checked directly.

(iii). It is straightforward to check (by taking two derivatives) that h is nonnegative and concave on $[0,1]$ and is monotone increasing on $[0,1/2]$. The assertion follows from the fact that h_0 is the re-parametrization of h, according to (4.2).

(iv). Since $h_0(0) = 0$ and $h_0(1/4) = 1$, the graph $y = h_0(t)$ and the line $y = 4t$ intersect at $(0,0)$ and $(1/4,1)$. By (i), h_0 is concave, which implies that the segment of the line $y = 4t$, $t \in [0,1/4]$ lies below the graph of h_0.

(v). It follows from (2.7) and (4.2) that

$$h_0(t) = 1 - \frac{1}{\log 2} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1-4t)^j}{2j(2j-1)},\ t \in [0,1/4). \tag{4.4}$$

which means that h_0 is the analytic function in the disc $\{z \in \mathbb{C} :\ |z - 1/4| < 1/4\}$. Hence, it suffices to consider the supremum over a smaller interval, say $[0,0.1]$ instead of $[0,1/4]$. We obtain, for $t \in (0,0.1]$,

$$h_0(t) \le -4t \log_2 t;\ |h_0'(t)| \le \frac{2}{\log 2} - \frac{\log(4t)}{\log 2};\ |h_0''(t)| \le \frac{1}{t \log 2} \tag{4.5}$$

and the result follows. ■

We will also use the matrix valued Jensen inequality.

Lemma 4.2 *Let $M = \{M_{jk}\}_{j,k=1}^n$ be an $n \times n$ hermitian matrix and $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a concave function. We have:*

$$(f(M))_{jj} \le f(M_{jj}), \quad j = 1, \dots, n. \tag{4.6}$$

Proof. According to the spectral theorem for hermitian matrices

$$(f(M))_{jj} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(\lambda) \mu_j(d\lambda),$$

where μ_j is non-negative measure of total mass 1. Hence, by the Jensen inequality and the spectral theorem the r.h.s. is bounded from above by

$$f\left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \lambda \mu_j(d\lambda)\right) = f(M_{jj}).$$

■

Lemma 4.3 *Let $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$ be non intersecting subsets of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2}$ be defined by (2.23), where P is an orthogonal projection in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. We have*

(i) $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2} \ge 0$;

(ii) $\|\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2}\| \le 1$ and if $\mathcal{C}_1 \subset \mathcal{C}_2^c := \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \mathcal{C}_2$, then $\|\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2}\| \le 1/4$;

(iii) If $\mathcal{C}_1' \subset \mathcal{C}_1''$, then $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1',\mathcal{C}_2}$ is the restriction of $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1'',\mathcal{C}_2}$ to $\ell^2(\mathcal{C}_1')$;

(iv) If $\mathcal{C}_2 = \cup_{j=1}^p \mathcal{C}_{2j}$ and $\{\mathcal{C}_{2j}\}_{j=1}^p$ are disjoint, then $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2} = \sum_{j=1}^p \Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_{2j}}$.

Another simple yet useful observation is that if A and B is a pair of Hermitian operators on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, and $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}$ is such that $f(0) = 0$, then

$$f(A)B = Bf(A) = 0 \text{ and } f(A+B) = f(A) + f(B), \text{ whenever } AB = BA = 0. \tag{4.7}$$

Both relations can be seen from the fact that there exists a basis $\{v_n\}$ on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ that consists of eigenvectors for A and B with the property that either $Av_n = \lambda_n v_n \neq 0$ and $Bv_n = 0$, or $Bv_n = \mu_n v_n \neq 0$ and $Av_n = 0$, or $Av_n = Bv_n = 0$.

A natural tool for the trace estimates of an operator A is its α-Schatten norm

$$\|A\|_\alpha = (\| \, |A|^\alpha \, \|_1)^{1/\alpha}, \tag{4.8}$$

where $|A| = (A^*A)^{1/2}$ and $\|\cdot\|_1$ is the trace norm, $\|A\|_1 = \operatorname{Tr}|A|$.

Note that for $\alpha \in (0,1)$ it is actually a quasi-norm, because it satisfies the modified triangle inequality: $\|A+B\|_\alpha \leq C_\alpha \|A\|_\alpha + \|B\|_\alpha \quad C_\alpha = 2^{1/\alpha - 1}$. On the other hand, the inequalities

$$\|A+B\|_\alpha^\alpha \leq \|A\|_\alpha^\alpha + \|B\|_\alpha^\alpha, \quad \alpha \in (0,1) \tag{4.9}$$

and

$$\|AB\|_\alpha \leq \|A\|\|B\|_\alpha; \quad \|AB\|_\alpha \leq \|B\|\|A\|_\alpha \tag{4.10}$$

hold in this case, and will be systematically used below.

The next assertion plays an important role in our analysis.

Lemma 4.4 *Assume that A and B are self-adjoint operators in the α-Schatten class with $\alpha \in (0,1]$ such that $0 \leq A, B \leq 1/4$ and that f satisfies Condition 3.1. Then $f(A)$ and $f(B)$ are trace class and*

$$|\operatorname{Tr} f(A) - \operatorname{Tr} f(B)| \leq C \, \| |A-B|^\alpha \|_1 = C \, \|A-B\|_\alpha^\alpha. \tag{4.11}$$

Proof. It follows from the definition of $\|\cdot\|_1$ that

$$|\operatorname{Tr} f(A) - \operatorname{Tr} f(B)| = |\operatorname{Tr}(f(A) - f(B))| \leq \|f(A) - f(B)\|_1.$$

We will use now a particular case of Theorem 2.4 of [41], according to which if f satisfies Condition 3.1 and $\alpha \in (0,1]$, then for

$$\|f(A) - f(B)\|_1 \leq C \, \| |A-B|^\alpha \|_1,$$

provided $0 \leq A, B \leq 1/4$.[2] Combining the above two bounds, we obtain (4.11). Plugging in (4.11) $B = 0$ ($A = 0$), we find that $f(A)$ (respectively $f(B)$) are trace class. ∎

We will also need the following bound

$$\sum_{y \in \mathcal{C}^c} \mathrm{e}^{-\gamma|x-y|} \leq C \, \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\gamma \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\mathcal{C})}{2}}, \quad x \in \mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d, \tag{4.12}$$

where $\partial\mathcal{C}$ is the boundary of $\mathcal{C}$ (see (2.19)). Indeed, for $\mathcal{C}_x = \{y \in \mathcal{C} : \ |x-y| \leq \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\mathcal{C})\}$, we have

$$|x-y| \geq \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\mathcal{C}) + \operatorname{dist}(y, \mathcal{C}_x), \ \forall y \in \mathcal{C}^c.$$

[2] In [41], f has to be globally defined. The restriction $0 \leq A, B \leq 1/4$ allows us to consider f defined on the interval $[0, 1/4]$.

This implies

$$\sum_{y\in\mathcal{C}^c} \mathrm{e}^{-\gamma|x-y|} \le \mathrm{e}^{-\gamma\,\mathrm{dist}(x,\partial\mathcal{C})} \sum_{y\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \mathrm{e}^{-\gamma\,\mathrm{dist}(y,\mathcal{C}_x)} \le \mathrm{e}^{-\gamma\,\mathrm{dist}(x,\partial\mathcal{C})} \sum_{y\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\sum_{z\in\mathcal{C}_x} \mathrm{e}^{-\gamma|y-z|}$$
$$= \mathrm{e}^{-\gamma\,\mathrm{dist}(x,\partial\mathcal{C})} \sum_{z\in\mathcal{C}_x}\sum_{y\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \mathrm{e}^{-\gamma|y-z|} \le C\,|\mathcal{C}_x|\,\mathrm{e}^{-\gamma\,\mathrm{dist}(x,\partial\mathcal{C})},$$

and (4.12) follows from $|\mathcal{C}_x| = (2\,\mathrm{dist}(x,\partial\mathcal{C})+1)^d$.

A similar argument yields for any $\mathcal{C}\subset\mathbb{Z}^d$

$$\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \mathrm{e}^{-\gamma\,\mathrm{dist}(x,\mathcal{C})} \le C\ |\mathcal{C}|\,. \tag{4.13}$$

We are now ready to establish important technical estimates of the paper:

Lemma 4.5 *Let $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$ be non-intersecting subsets of $\mathbb{Z}^d$. Suppose that Assumption 3.2 holds and f satisfies Condition 3.1. Then we have:*

(i) for $m = 1, 2, ...$

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{\left|f\left(\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2}\right)(x,x)\right|^m\right\} \le C_m\,\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\alpha\gamma\,\mathrm{dist}(x,\partial\mathcal{C}_2)}{2}},\ x\in\mathcal{C}_1, \tag{4.14}$$

where C_m depends only on m;

(ii)

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{\left\|\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2}\right\|_\alpha^{2\alpha}\right\} \le C\ \min\left(|\partial\mathcal{C}_1|^2, |\partial\mathcal{C}_2|^2\right)\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\alpha\gamma\,\mathrm{dist}(\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2)}{2}}; \tag{4.15}$$

(iii) assume that $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2$ are separated by an affine hyperplane $\mathcal{H} = \{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d :\ x\cdot e_n = k\}$ for some n and k and that the set $\mathcal{C}_1$ is contained in the infinite cylinder $\mathcal{D}$ (that extends in e_n direction), and that $\mathcal{C}_1\cap\mathcal{H}\neq\emptyset$. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the cross-section of $\mathcal{D}$ with $\mathcal{H}$, i.e., $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{D}\cap\mathcal{H}$. Then

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{\left\|\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2}\right\|_\alpha^{2\alpha}\right\} \le C\ |\mathcal{G}|^2\ \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\alpha\gamma\,\mathrm{dist}(\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2)}{2}}. \tag{4.16}$$

Proof. (i) It follows from (3.2) and the spectral theorem for hermitian matrices that

$$\left|f\left(\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2}\right)(x,x)\right| \le C\,(\Pi^\alpha_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2})(x,x).$$

We now apply Lemma 4.2 to conclude that

$$\left|f\left(\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2}\right)(x,x)\right| \le C\ \left(\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2}(x,x)\right)^\alpha.$$

This bound, (2.23) and the inequality $0\le\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2}\le 1$ (see Lemma 4.3 (ii)) imply that for $m\ge 1$

$$\left|f\left(\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2}\right)(x,x)\right|^m \le C^m\ \left(\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2}(x,x)\right)^{m\alpha} \le C^m\ \left(\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2}(x,x)\right)^\alpha. \tag{4.17}$$

Next, it follows from (2.23) and (2.29) that

$$\left(\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2}(x,x)\right)^\alpha \le \left(\sum_{y\in\mathcal{C}_2}|P(x,y)|^2\right)^\alpha \le \left(\sum_{y\in\mathcal{C}_2}|P(x,y)|\right)^\alpha. \tag{4.18}$$

Now, by using in the r.h.s. the Hölder inequality for expectations and (2.21), we obtain

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{\left|f\left(\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2}\right)(x,x)\right|^m\right\} \leq C^m \left(\sum_{y\in\mathcal{C}_2} \mathbf{E}\left\{|P(x,y)|\right\}\right)^\alpha \tag{4.19}$$
$$\leq C_{1m}\left(\sum_{y\in\mathcal{C}_2} \mathrm{e}^{-\gamma|x-y|}\right)^\alpha \leq C_m\,\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\alpha\gamma\,\mathrm{dist}(x,\partial\mathcal{C}_2)}{2}},$$

where in the last step we used (4.12).

(ii) Taking into account that $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2}$, hence $\Pi^\alpha_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2}$, is positive definite, we deduce

$$\|\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2}\|_\alpha^{2\alpha} = (\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2})^\alpha)^2 = \left(\sum_{x\in\mathcal{C}_1}(\Pi^\alpha_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2})(x,x)\right)^2.$$

We now choose $f(x)=x^\alpha$ and $m=1$ in Lemma 4.5 (i) and use inequalities (3.41) and

$$\mathrm{dist}(x,\partial\mathcal{C}_2) \geq \mathrm{dist}(x,\partial\mathcal{C}_1) + \mathrm{dist}(\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2), \quad x\in\mathcal{C}_1 \tag{4.20}$$

to get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}\{||\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2}||_\alpha^{2\alpha}\} &\leq C\left(\sum_{x\in\mathcal{C}_1}\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\alpha\gamma\,\mathrm{dist}(x,\partial\mathcal{C}_2)}{2}}\right)^2 \leq C\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\gamma\,\mathrm{dist}(\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2)}\left(\sum_{x\in\mathcal{C}_1}\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\alpha\gamma\,\mathrm{dist}(x,\partial\mathcal{C}_1)}{2}}\right)^2\\ &\leq C\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\gamma\,\mathrm{dist}(\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2)}\left(\sum_{x\in\partial\mathcal{C}_1}\sum_{y\in\mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-\frac{\alpha\gamma|x-y|}{2}}\right)^2 \leq C|\partial\mathcal{C}_1|^2\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\gamma\,\mathrm{dist}(\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2)}.\end{aligned}$$

But since in view of (2.23)

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2} = AA^*,\ \ \Pi_{\mathcal{C}_2,\mathcal{C}_1} = A^*A,\ \ A=\chi_{\mathcal{C}_1}P\chi_{\mathcal{C}_2}, \tag{4.21}$$

we have $\|\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2}\|_\alpha = \|\Pi_{\mathcal{C}_2,\mathcal{C}_1}\|_\alpha$, and the result follows.

(iii) The assertion follows by the same argument used in Part (ii), if we replace the bound (4.20) with

$$2\,\mathrm{dist}(x,\partial\mathcal{C}_2) \geq \mathrm{dist}(x,\partial\mathcal{G}) + \mathrm{dist}(\mathcal{C}_1,\mathcal{C}_2), \quad x\in\mathcal{C}_1,$$

valid in this more restricted context. ■

Lemma 4.6 *Suppose that Assumption 3.2 holds and f satisfies Condition 3.1. Then, for any $d\geq 1$, we have*

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{\|f(\Pi_{\Lambda_M})\|_1^2\right\} \leq CM^{2(d-1)}$$

and

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{\|\chi_{\Lambda_M} f(\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+})\chi_{\Lambda_M}\|_1^2\right\} \leq CM^{2(d-1)},$$

where Λ_M, $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}$, and $\mathbb{Z}^d_+$ are introduced in (2.20), (2.25) *and* (2.35), *respectively.*

Proof. It follows from (3.2), the spectral theorem and the definition (4.8) that

$$\|f(\Pi_{\Lambda_M})\|_1 \leq C\,\|\Pi_{\Lambda_M}\|_\alpha^\alpha.$$

Hence, Lemma 4.5 (ii) yields

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{\|f\left(\Pi_{\Lambda_M}\right)\|_1^2\right\} \leq C\,|\partial\Lambda_M|^2 = C_1\,M^{2(d-1)}.$$

On the other hand, using (3.41) and Lemma 4.5 (i), we can bound

$$\mathbf{E}\Big\{\Big(\operatorname{Tr}\chi_{\Lambda_M} f(\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+})\chi_{\Lambda_M}\Big)^2\Big\} \le C\Big(\sum_{x\in\Lambda_M} \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\alpha\gamma\,\mathrm{dist}(x,\partial\mathbb{Z}^d_+)}{2}}\Big)^2$$
$$\le C\Big(\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\sum_{y\in\partial\mathbb{Z}^d_+\cap\Lambda_M} \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\alpha\gamma|x-y|}{2}}\Big)^2 \le C_1\,|\partial\Lambda_M|^2 = C_2\,M^{2(d-1)}.$$

■

Lemma 4.7 *Suppose that Assumption 3.2 holds and f satisfies Condition 3.1. We have a bound*

$$\mathbf{E}\Big\{\Big|\operatorname{Tr} f\left(\Pi_{\Lambda_M}\right) - \sum_{n=-d}^{d} \operatorname{Tr}\chi_{\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_M} f\left(\Pi_{\Lambda_M}\right)\chi_{\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_M}\Big|^2\Big\} \le C R_d(M), \tag{4.22}$$

where $\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_M$ and $R_d(M)$ are defined in (3.12) *and* (3.28) *respectively.*

Proof. Given $\ell\in\mathbb{N}$, write

$$\Lambda_M = \Lambda_{M-\ell}\cup\mathcal{S}_M\cup_{n=1}^{2d}\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_M,\quad \mathcal{S}_M = \Lambda_M\setminus\Big(\Lambda_{M-\ell}\cup_{n=1}^{2d}\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_M\Big) \tag{4.23}$$

to obtain

$$\operatorname{Tr} f\left(\Pi_{\Lambda_M}\right) - \sum_{n=1}^{2d}\operatorname{Tr}\chi_{\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_M} f\left(\Pi_{\Lambda_M}\right)\chi_{\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_M} = \operatorname{Tr}\chi_{\Lambda_{M-\ell}} f\left(\Pi_{\Lambda_M}\right)\chi_{\Lambda_{M-\ell}} + \operatorname{Tr}\chi_{\mathcal{S}_M} f\left(\Pi_{\Lambda_M}\right)\chi_{\mathcal{S}_M}.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathcal{S}_M| &= |\Lambda_M| - |\Lambda_{M-\ell}| - 2d\left|\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_M\right| \\ &= (2M+1)^d - (2M-2\ell+1)^d - 2d\ell\,(2M-4\ell-1)^{d-1} \\ &\le C_d(d-1)\ell^2 M^{d-2},\end{aligned}$$

the application of (3.41) and Lemma 4.5 (i) yield

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{\left|\operatorname{Tr}\chi_{\Lambda_{M-\ell}} f\left(\Pi_{\Lambda_M}\right)\chi_{\Lambda_{M-\ell}}\right|^2\right\} \le C\,\left(M^d\,\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\alpha\gamma\ell}{4}}\right)^2$$

and

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{\left|\operatorname{Tr}\chi_{\mathcal{S}_M} f\left(\Pi_{\Lambda_M}\right)\chi_{\mathcal{S}_M}\right|^2\right\} \le C\,|\mathcal{S}_M|^2 \le C\left((d-1)\ell^2 M^{d-2}\right)^2,$$

implying the result. ■

Lemma 4.8 *Suppose that Assumption 3.2 holds and f satisfies Condition 3.1. Then, for each $n=\pm1,...,\pm d$, we have*

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{\left|\operatorname{Tr}\chi_{\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_M} f\left(\Pi_{\Lambda_M}\right)\chi_{\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_M} - \operatorname{Tr} f\left(\chi_{\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_M}\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}}\chi_{\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_M}\right)\right|^2\right\} \le C\,R_d(M), \tag{4.24}$$

where $R_d(M)$ is defined in (3.28) *and $\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}$ is a rigid lattice motion of $\mathbb{Z}^d_+$ such that $\Lambda_M\subset\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}$ and $\mathcal{F}^{(n)}_M\subset\partial\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 4.5. Set

$$\mathcal{T}_M = \Lambda_M \setminus \mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}, \tag{4.25}$$

then

$$\Pi_{\Lambda_M} - \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} \Pi_{\Lambda_M} \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} - \chi_{\mathcal{T}_M} \Pi_{\Lambda_M} \chi_{\mathcal{T}_M} = \chi_{\mathcal{T}_M} \Pi_{\Lambda_M} \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} + h.c.$$

We claim that

$$\mathbf{E} \left\{ \left\| \chi_{\mathcal{T}_M} \Pi_{\Lambda_M} \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} \right\|_\alpha^{2\alpha} \right\} \leq C \, R_d(M). \tag{4.26}$$

This bound, (4.7), Lemma 4.4 and (4.9) yield

$$\mathbf{E} \left\{ \left| \operatorname{Tr} \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} f\left(\Pi_{\Lambda_M}\right) \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} - \operatorname{Tr} f\left(\chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} \Pi_{\Lambda_M} \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} \right) \right|^2 \right\} \leq C \, R_d(M). \tag{4.27}$$

We also claim that

$$\mathbf{E} \left\{ \left\| \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} \Pi_{\Lambda_M} \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} - \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} \Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}} \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} \right\|_\alpha^{2\alpha} \right\} \leq C \, R_d(M). \tag{4.28}$$

Combining this bound with (4.27), (4.7), Lemma 4.4, and (4.9), we obtain the assertion of the lemma.

To establish (4.28) we note that by (2.23) and Lemma 4.3 (iii)

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} \left(\Pi_{\Lambda_M} - \Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}} \right) \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} \right\|_\alpha^{2\alpha} \\ &= \left\| \Pi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}, \Lambda_M^c} - \Pi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}, (\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n})^c} \right\|_\alpha^{2\alpha} = \left\| \Pi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}, \Lambda_M^c \setminus (\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n})^c} \right\|_\alpha^{2\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

observe that $\operatorname{dist}\left(\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}, \Lambda_M^c \setminus \left(\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n} \right)^c \right) \geq 2\ell$, and use Lemma 4.5 (ii).

To get (4.26), we further split $\mathcal{T}_M$ of (4.25) as $\mathcal{T}_M = \mathcal{R}_M \cup (\mathcal{T}_M \setminus \mathcal{R}_M)$, with

$$\mathcal{R}_M = \{ x \in \mathcal{T}_M : \ \operatorname{dist}\left(x, \left(\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n} \right)^c \right) \geq \ell \}.$$

Hence, using (4.9), we bound

$$\left\| \chi_{\mathcal{T}_M} \Pi_{\Lambda_M} \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} \right\|_\alpha^{2\alpha} \leq C \left(\left\| \chi_{\mathcal{R}_M} \Pi_{\Lambda_M} \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} \right\|_\alpha^{2\alpha} + \left\| \chi_{\mathcal{T}_M \setminus \mathcal{R}_M} \Pi_{\Lambda_M} \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} \right\|_\alpha^{2\alpha} \right).$$

The second term on the right is estimated simply as

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \chi_{\mathcal{T}_M \setminus \mathcal{R}_M} \Pi_{\Lambda_M} \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} \right\|_\alpha^{2\alpha} &\leq \left\| \chi_{\mathcal{T}_M \setminus \mathcal{R}_M} \right\|_\alpha^{2\alpha} \leq \left| \mathcal{T}_M \setminus \mathcal{R}_M \right|^2 \\ &\leq C \left((d-1) \ell^2 M^{d-2} \right)^2 \leq C \, R_d(M). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\chi_{\mathcal{R}_M} \Pi_{\Lambda_M} \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} = \chi_{\mathcal{R}_M} P \, \chi_{\left(\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n} \right)^c} P \chi_{B_M^{(n)}} + \chi_{\mathcal{R}_M} \, P \, \chi_{\Lambda_M^c \setminus \left(\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n} \right)^c} P \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}}.$$

This and (4.9) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \chi_{\mathcal{R}_M} \Pi_{\Lambda_M} \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} \right\|_\alpha^{2\alpha} &\leq C \left(\left\| \chi_{\mathcal{R}_M} P \chi_{\left(\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n} \right)^c} \right\|_\alpha^{2\alpha} + \left\| \chi_{\Lambda_M^c \setminus \left(\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n} \right)^c} P \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} \right\|_\alpha^{2\alpha} \right) \\ &= C \left(\left\| \Pi_{\mathcal{R}_M, \left(\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n} \right)^c} \right\|_{\alpha/2}^{2\alpha} + \left\| \Pi_{\Lambda_M^c \setminus \left(\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n} \right)^c, \, \mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} \right\|_{\alpha/2}^{2\alpha} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Recall now that

$$\operatorname{dist}\left(\mathcal{R}_M, \left(\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}\right)^c\right) = \ell; \quad \operatorname{dist}\left(\Lambda_M^c \setminus \left(\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}\right)^c, \mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}\right) = 2\ell$$

by construction. This and Lemma 4.5 (ii) imply

$$\mathbf{E}\left(\left\|\Pi_{\mathcal{R}_M,\left(\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}\right)^c}\right\|^{2\alpha}_{\alpha/2} + \left\|\Pi_{\Lambda_M^c\setminus\left(\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}\right)^c,\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}}\right\|^{2\alpha}_{\alpha/2}\right) \le C\, R_d(M).$$

Putting all bounds together we get (4.26). ■

Lemma 4.9 *Suppose that Assumption 3.2 holds and f satisfies Condition 3.1. Then, for every $n = \pm 1, ..., \pm d$, we have*

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{\left|\operatorname{Tr}\chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} f\left(\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}}\right)\chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} - \operatorname{Tr} f\left(\chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}}\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}}\chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}}\right)\right|^2\right\} \le C\, R_d(M), \tag{4.29}$$

where $\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}$, $\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}$ and $R_d(M)$ are the same as in the previous lemma.

Proof. We first observe that, thanks to (4.7),

$$\begin{aligned} f\left(\chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}}\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}}\chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}}\right) &= \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} f\left(\chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}}\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}}\chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}}\right)\chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} \\ &= \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} f\left(\chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}}\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}}\chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} + \chi_{(B_M^{(n)})^c}\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}}\chi_{(\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)})^c}\right)\chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the result follows from Lemmas 4.4 and (4.9) once we establish the bound

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{\left\|\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+} - \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}}\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+}\chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} - \chi_{(B_M^{(n)})^c}\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+}\chi_{(B_M^{(n)})^c}\right\|^{2\alpha}_{\alpha}\right\} \le C\, R_d(M). \tag{4.30}$$

To this end, using (4.9), we bound

$$\mathbf{E}\Big\{\left\|\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+} - \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}}\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+}\chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} - \chi_{(B_M^{(n)})^c}\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+}\chi_{(B_M^{(n)})^c}\right\|^{2\alpha}_{\alpha}\Big\} \le C\,\mathbf{E}\Big\{\left\|\chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}}\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+}\chi_{(B_M^{(n)})^c}\right\|^{2\alpha}_{\alpha}\Big\}.$$

The remainder of the argument strongly resembles the one used to obtain (4.28), with usage of Lemma 4.5 (iii) instead of Lemma 4.5 (ii). We choose $\mathcal{C}_2$ in the lemma to be the semi-infinite parallelepiped $\mathcal{D}_2$ adjacent to the face $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_M^{(n)}$ (3.11) of $\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}$ from the exterior of Λ_M, i.e., belonging to $(\mathbb{Z}^d_+)^c$. We choose $\mathcal{C}_1$ to be the semi-infinite parallelepiped $\mathcal{D}_1$ adjacent to $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_M^{(n)}$ and extended in the direction opposite to that of $\mathcal{D}_2$ (so it belongs to $\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}$ and contains $\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}$). For $\mathcal{G}$ in Lemma 4.5 (iii) we use $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_M^{(n)}$. Let $\mathcal{D}_1^- = \mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n} \setminus \mathcal{D}_1$ and let $\mathcal{D}_2^- = (\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n})^c \setminus \mathcal{D}_2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}}\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}}\chi_{(B_M^{(n)})^c} &= \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} P \chi_{(\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n})^c} P \chi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+\setminus\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} \\ &= \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} P \chi_{\mathcal{D}_2} P \chi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+\setminus\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} + \chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} P \chi_{\mathcal{D}_2^-} P \chi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+\setminus\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}}, \end{aligned}$$

in view of (2.23), so using (4.9) and (4.10) we get

$$||\chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}}\Pi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_{+,n}}\chi_{(B_M^{(n)})^c}||^{2\alpha}_{\alpha} \le C(||\chi_{\mathcal{D}_2} P \chi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+\setminus\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}}||^{2\alpha}_{\alpha} + ||\chi_{\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}} P \chi_{\mathcal{D}_2^-}||^{2\alpha}_{\alpha}).$$

To estimate $\mathbf{E}\{\|\chi_{\mathcal{D}_2} P \chi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+\setminus\mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}}\|^{2\alpha}_{\alpha}\}$ we first remove a set of cardinality $C(d-1)\ell^2 M^{d-2}$ from the neighborhood of the "corners" of $\mathcal{D}_2$ common with $\mathbb{Z}^d_+ \setminus \mathcal{B}_M^{(n)}$, to get $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}_2}$ such that

$\operatorname{dist}(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}_2}, \mathbb{Z}^d_+ \setminus \mathcal{B}^{(n)}_M) \geq \ell$. Now we can bound $\mathbf{E}\left\{||\chi_{\widetilde{\mathcal{D}_2}} \Pi \chi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+ \setminus \mathcal{B}^{(n)}_M}||^2_\alpha\right\}$ using Lemma 4.5 (iii), with $\mathcal{G} = \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_M$ and the estimate $|\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_M| \leq (2M+1)^{d-1}$. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{E}\left\{||\chi_{\mathcal{D}_2} P \chi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+ \setminus \mathcal{B}^{(n)}_M}||^{2\alpha}_\alpha\right\} \\ &\quad \leq \mathbf{E}\left\{||\chi_{\mathcal{D}_2 \setminus \widetilde{\mathcal{D}_2}} P \chi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+ \setminus \mathcal{B}^{(n)}_M}||^{2\alpha}_\alpha\right\} + \mathbf{E}\left\{||\chi_{\widetilde{\mathcal{D}_2}} P \chi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+ \setminus \mathcal{B}^{(n)}_M}||^{2\alpha}_\alpha\right\} \\ &\quad \leq C\left(|\mathcal{D}_2 \setminus \widetilde{\mathcal{D}_2}|^2 + \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\alpha\gamma\ell}{2}} |\partial\widetilde{\mathcal{D}_2}|^2\right) \leq C R_d(M), \end{aligned} \tag{4.31}$$

in view of (4.9) – (4.10). An analogous argument can be applied to the pair $(\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_M, \mathcal{D}^-_2)$ and yields

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{||\chi_{\mathcal{D}_2} P \chi_{\mathbb{Z}^d_+ \setminus \mathcal{B}^{(n)}_M}||^{2\alpha}_\alpha\right\} \leq C R_d(M). \tag{4.32}$$

Combining bounds (4.31) and (4.32), we arrive at (4.30). ■

Lemma 4.10 *Suppose that $P(\omega)$ is an ergodic projection satisfying Assumption 3.2 and that f satisfies Condition 3.1. Let ℓ, N be a pair of positive integers, let*

$$\mathcal{Q} = [-\ell, \ell] \times [-N, N]^{d-1}$$

be a rectangular lattice prism, let

$$\mathcal{Q}_a = \left\{x \in \mathcal{Q} \cap \mathbb{Z}^d_- : \ \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\mathcal{Q}) \geq a, \ a < \ell\right\}; \ \mathcal{Q}_+ = Q \cap (\mathbb{Z}^d_-)^c$$

and let (cf. (3.57))

$$\widehat{\Pi}_{\mathcal{Q}_a, \mathcal{Q}_+}(\omega) = \chi_{\mathcal{Q}_a} \widehat{P}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\omega) \chi_{\mathcal{Q}_+} \widehat{P}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\omega) \chi_{\mathcal{Q}_a}, \tag{4.33}$$

where $\widehat{P}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\omega)$ is defined in Assumption 3.3.

Then we have

$$\mathbf{E}\Big\{\left|\operatorname{Tr} f\left(\widehat{\Pi}_{\mathcal{Q}_a, \mathcal{Q}_+}\right) - \operatorname{Tr} f\left(\Pi_{\mathcal{Q}_a, \mathcal{Q}_+}\right)\right|^2\Big\} \leq C \ |\partial\mathcal{Q}|^5 \, \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha c a}, \tag{4.34}$$

for some $C < \infty, \ c > 0$, and a sufficiently small value of ℓ/N.

Proof. The assertion follows from the estimate

$$\mathbf{E}\Big\{\left\|\widehat{\Pi}_{\mathcal{Q}_a, \mathcal{Q}_+} - \Pi_{\mathcal{Q}_a, \mathcal{Q}_+}\right\|^{2\alpha}_\alpha\Big\} \leq C \ |\partial\mathcal{Q}|^5 \, \mathrm{e}^{-c a}. \tag{4.35}$$

Indeed, combining this bound with Lemma 4.4 and (4.9), we get the desired result.

To obtain (4.35) we first decompose

$$\begin{aligned} &\widehat{\Pi}_{\mathcal{Q}_a, \mathcal{Q}_+} - \Pi_{\mathcal{Q}_a, \mathcal{Q}_+} \\ &\qquad = \chi_{\mathcal{Q}_a}\left(\widehat{P}_{\mathcal{Q}} - P\right)\chi_{\mathcal{Q}_+} P \chi_{\mathcal{Q}_a} + \chi_{\mathcal{Q}_a} \widehat{P}_{\mathcal{Q}} \chi_{\mathcal{Q}_+}\left(\widehat{P}_{\mathcal{Q}} - P\right)\chi_{\mathcal{Q}_a}, \end{aligned}$$

and use (4.9) and (4.10) to obtain

$$\left\|\widehat{\Pi}_{\mathcal{Q}_a, \mathcal{Q}_+} - \Pi_{\mathcal{Q}_a, \mathcal{Q}_+}\right\|^{2\alpha}_\alpha \leq C \left\|\chi_{\mathcal{Q}_a}\left(\widehat{P}_{\mathcal{Q}} - P\right)\chi_{\mathcal{Q}_+}\right\|^{2\alpha}_\alpha.$$

Let $A = \chi_{\mathcal{Q}_a}\left(\widehat{P}_{\mathcal{Q}} - P\right)\chi_{\mathcal{Q}_+}$, then $\|A\| \leq \|\widehat{P}_{\mathcal{Q}} - P\| \leq 2$, hence $0 \leq A^*A/4 \leq 1$, and so $|A/2|^\alpha = (A^*A/4)^{\alpha/2} \leq A^*A/4$. This leads to the bound

$$\left\|\chi_{\mathcal{Q}_a}\left(\widehat{P}_{\mathcal{Q}} - P\right)\chi_{\mathcal{Q}_+}\right\|^{2\alpha}_\alpha \leq C \left\|\chi_{\mathcal{Q}_+}\left(\widehat{P}_{\mathcal{Q}} - P\right)\chi_{\mathcal{Q}_a}\left(\widehat{P}_{\mathcal{Q}} - P\right)\chi_{\mathcal{Q}_+}\right\|^2_1,$$

so (3.41) yields

$$\mathbf{E}\Big\{ \Big\| \widehat{\Pi}_{\mathcal{Q}_a,\mathcal{Q}_+} - \Pi_{\mathcal{Q}_a,\mathcal{Q}_+} \Big\|_\alpha^{2\alpha} \Big\} \le C\, \mathbf{E}\Big\{ \Big(\sum_{x\in\mathcal{Q}_+} \sum_{y\in\mathcal{Q}_a} \Big| \widehat{P}_{\mathcal{Q}}(x,y) - P(x,y) \Big|^2 \Big)^2 \Big\}$$

$$\le C \left(\sum_{x\in(\mathbb{Z}^d_+)^c} \sum_{y\in\mathcal{Q}_a} \Big(\mathbf{E}\Big\{ \Big| \widehat{P}_{\mathcal{Q}}(x,y) - P(x,y) \Big|^4 \Big\} \Big)^{1/2} \right)^2 .$$

Since $\|\widehat{P}_{\mathcal{Q}} - P\| \le 2$, we have $\Big| \widehat{P}_{\mathcal{Q}}(x,y) - P(x,y) \Big|^4 \le 8 \Big| \widehat{P}_{\mathcal{Q}}(x,y) - P(x,y) \Big|$. Using now Assumption 3.3 and (3.41), we deduce

$$\mathbf{E}\Big\{ \Big\| \widehat{\Pi}_{\mathcal{Q}_a,\mathcal{Q}_+} - \Pi_{\mathcal{Q}_a,\mathcal{Q}_+} \Big\|_\alpha^{2\alpha} \Big\} \le C \left(\sum_{x\in\mathcal{Q}_+} \sum_{y\in\mathcal{Q}_a} \Big(\mathbf{E}\Big\{ \Big| \widehat{P}_{\mathcal{Q}}(x,y) - P(x,y) \Big| \Big\} \Big)^{1/2} \right)^2$$

$$\le C_1\, |\partial\mathcal{Q}| \Big(\sum_{x\in\mathcal{Q}_+} \mathrm{e}^{-\gamma_1 \operatorname{dist}(x,\partial\mathcal{Q})} \sum_{y\in\mathcal{Q}_a} \mathrm{e}^{-\gamma_1 \operatorname{dist}(y,\partial\mathcal{Q})} \Big)^2 \le C_2\, |\partial\mathcal{Q}|^5\, \mathrm{e}^{-\gamma_1 a},$$

where in the last step we used (4.13) with $\partial\mathcal{Q}$ as $\mathcal{C}$ and $\operatorname{dist}(\partial\mathcal{Q}_a, \partial\mathcal{Q}) \ge a$. ■

We will now present an important example of the discrete Schrödinger operator, for which Assumption 3.3 is valid, and so Theorem 3.7 and Result 4 are applicable.

Lemma 4.11 *Let $H(\omega)$ be the discrete Schrödinger operator* (2.14) *acting in $l^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ whose ergodic potential is*

$$V(\omega) = gQ(\omega), \quad Q(\omega) = \{Q(x,\omega)\}_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d}, \tag{4.36}$$

where $g > 0$ and $\{Q(x,\omega)\}_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ is a collection of i.i.d. random variables such that their common probability law F satisfies (2.45). Let $H_\Lambda(\omega) = H(\omega)|_\Lambda$ be the (Dirichlet) restriction of H to a domain $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}$ and let

$$P^\Lambda(\omega) = \mathcal{E}_{H_\Lambda(\omega)}(I) \tag{4.37}$$

be the spectral projection of $H_\Lambda(\omega)$ corresponding to an interval I. Then a choice $\widehat{P}_\Lambda(\omega) = P^\Lambda(\omega)$ satisfies Assumption 3.3 for the cases described by items (a) – (c) of the list below formula (2.21).

Proof. It follows from the spectral theorem that if

$$G(\zeta) := (H-\zeta)^{-1} = \{G(\zeta;x,y)\}_{x,y\in\mathbb{Z}^d},\ G^\Lambda(\zeta) := (H_\Lambda - \zeta)^{-1} = \{G^\Lambda(\zeta;x,y)\}_{x,y\in\Lambda},$$

and

$$\widehat{G}_\Lambda(\zeta) := (H_\Lambda \oplus H_{\Lambda^c} - \zeta)^{-1} = \{\widehat{G}_\Lambda(\zeta;x,y)\}_{x,y\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$$

are the resolvents of H, H_Λ and $H_\Lambda \oplus H_{\Lambda^c}$, then we have:

$$P(x,y) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_K G(\zeta;x,y)d\zeta,\ x,y\in\mathbb{Z}^d \tag{4.38}$$

and

$$P^\Lambda(x,y) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_K G^\Lambda(\zeta;x,y)d\zeta,\ x,y\in\Lambda, \tag{4.39}$$

with probability 1, [3]. Here K is a rectangular contour, which encircles I and crosses transversally the real axis at the endpoints of I (recall that the probability that a given point of the real axis is an eigenvalue of H is zero, cf. Theorems 2.10, 2.12 and 4.21 in [32].

We will now use the resolvent identity

$$G(\zeta) - \widehat{G}_\Lambda(\zeta) = G(\zeta)(H_\Lambda \oplus H_{\Lambda^c} - H)\widehat{G}_\Lambda(\zeta),$$

taking into account that the non-diagonal parts of H and $H_\Lambda \oplus H_{\Lambda^c}$ are $-\Delta$ (see (2.3)) and $-\Delta_\Lambda \oplus \Delta_{\Lambda^c}$, respectively. This gives for $x, y \in \Lambda$

$$\begin{aligned} G(\zeta; x, y) - G^\Lambda(\zeta; x, y) &= G(\zeta; x, y) - \widehat{G}_\Lambda(\zeta; x, y) \\ &= -\sum_{(u,v)\in\widetilde{\Lambda}} G(\zeta; x, u)\widehat{G}_\Lambda(\zeta; v, y) = -\sum_{(u,v)\in\widetilde{\Lambda}} G(\zeta; x, u)G^\Lambda(\zeta; v, y), \end{aligned}$$

where $\widetilde{\Lambda}$ is a collection of bonds between points $v \in \partial\Lambda$ and their nearest neighbors in Λ^c. This and the elementary inequality

$$\Big(\sum |a_j|\Big)^s \le \sum |a_j|^s, \quad s \in [0, 1]$$

give

$$|G(\zeta; x, y) - G^\Lambda(\zeta; x, y)|^{s/2} \le \sum_{(u,v)\in\widetilde{\Lambda}} |(G(\zeta; x, u)G^\Lambda(\zeta; v, y)|^{s/2}, \ \ x, y \in \Lambda.$$

Taking expectation and using the Hölder inequality in the r.h.s., we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{E}\{|G(\zeta; x, y) - G^\Lambda(\zeta; x, y)|^{s/2}\} \\ &\le \sum_{(u,v)\in\widetilde{\Lambda}} \Big(\mathbf{E}\{|G(\zeta; x, u)|^s\}\, \mathbf{E}\{|G^\Lambda(\zeta; v, y)|^s\}\Big)^{1/2}, \ \ x, y \in \Lambda. \end{aligned} \tag{4.40}$$

We will now use one of basic results of spectral theory of random Schrödinger operator, known as the fractional moment decay, see [3, 4, 6]. It is the bound

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{|G(\lambda + i\varepsilon; x, y)|^s\right\} \le C\,(s)\mathrm{e}^{-\widetilde{\gamma}(s)|x-y|}, \ x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \tag{4.41}$$

valid under the assumptions of the lemma, for some $s \in (0, \tau)$, $C(s) < \infty$, $\widetilde{\gamma}(s) > 0$ and uniformly in $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\lambda \in I$. Similarly, under the same conditions we have

$$\mathbf{E}\{|G^\Lambda(\lambda + i\varepsilon; x, y)|^s\} \le C\,(s)\mathrm{e}^{-\widetilde{\gamma}(s)|x-y|} < \infty, \ \lambda \in I, \ x, y \in \Lambda. \tag{4.42}$$

These bounds, combined with the estimate

$$|(A - \zeta)^{-1}(x, y)| \le \|(A - \zeta)^{-1}\| \le |\Im\zeta|^{-1},$$

valid for the resolvent of any self-adjoint operators, and (4.38) – (4.40) imply for $x, y \in \Lambda$

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{E}\{|P(x, y) - P^\Lambda(x, y)|\} \\ &\quad\le \frac{1}{2\pi}\oint_K \mathbf{E}\{|G(\zeta; x, y) - G^\Lambda(\zeta.x, y)|^{s/2}\}|\Im\zeta|^{s/2-1}|d\zeta| \\ &\quad\le C_0|\partial\Lambda|\mathrm{e}^{-\widetilde{\gamma}R}\oint_K |\Im\zeta|^{s/2-1}||d\zeta| \le C|\partial\Lambda|\mathrm{e}^{-\widetilde{\gamma}R}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we verified the condition (3.4) of Assumption 3.3 for $\widehat{P}_\Lambda(\omega) = P^\Lambda(\omega)$ in this context. The condition (3.6) for such $\widehat{P}_\Lambda(\omega)$ readily follows from the fact that for any $\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ the projection $P^\Lambda(\omega)$ depends only on the collection $\{V(x, \omega)\}_{x\in\Lambda}$. Thus, if $\Lambda \cap \Lambda_g = \emptyset$, then $P^\Lambda(\omega)$ and $P^{\Lambda_h}(\omega)$ are independent and ξ and ξ_g in (3.6) are i.i.d. since $\{V(x)\}_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d}$ are i.i.d. variables. ■

Remark 4.12 The condition of the lemma on the probability law of the i.i.d. potential seem rather special, although they are easy to check. For more general but more involved conditions as well as for more general random operators for which the basic bounds (4.41) – (4.42) hold see [6] and references therein. It is worth also mentioning that (4.41) – (4.42) imply various other properties, which are commonly associated with Anderson localization: spectral an dynamical localization, exponential decay (2.21) of the projection kernel, local Poisson statistic of eigenvalues, etc. (see [6, 15, 42] for details and references).

5 Conclusions and Outlook

Here, we discuss our results and some interpretations and implications thereof. In this paper, we have proved that entanglement entropy of free d-dimensional disordered fermions satisfies the area law in the mean for any $d \geq 1$ when the Fermi energy lies in the exponentially localized part of the spectrum of the one body Hamiltonian. We have also shown that for $d \geq 2$ fluctuations of the entanglement entropy per unit surface area vanish as the block size tends to infinity, i.e., that the entanglement entropy is selfaveraging for $d \geq 2$.

The area law fails for translation invariant (clean) systems, which exhibit so called logarithmic corrections to the area law (see e.g. (2.42) and also [7, 12, 16, 19, 26, 27, 34, 43]). The difference in these two cases can be attributed to the inhibition of quantum correlations (quantum coherence) of free fermions in the presence of short-range correlated spatial noise. Mathematically, the large block behavior of the entanglement entropy for free fermions is controlled by the rate of decay at infinity of the off-diagonal matrix elements of the Fermi projection (2.9) (see also (2.22)) of the associated one body Hamiltonian. In the clean case, this decay is slow (see e.g. (2.40)), since the corresponding eigenstates are the plane waves. Consequently, in the clean case free fermions display long range quantum correlations and logarithmic corrections (2.42) to the area law. On the other hand, when the Fermi energy lies in the exponentially localized part of spectrum of the one body Hamiltonian, then the eigenstates and the Fermi projection decay exponentially (see (2.21). This leads to short range quantum correlations and the area law discussed in this paper.

Let us remark that for one-dimensional many body systems exponential decay of all multipoint correlations (exponential clustering property) implies an upper bound on area law, [11]. As was observed first in [17, 18], exponential clustering occurs for ground states of systems where the ground state energy is isolated from the rest of the many-body spectrum. On the other hand, in the disordered case (at least for the disordered free fermions), the exponential decay results not from the existence of the spectral gap but from the gapless spectrum with exponentially localized eigenfunctions of one body Hamiltonian.

From this perspective, the absence of the logarithmic corrections to the area law in disordered fermions systems is reminiscent of the absence of the d.c. conductivity and certain phase transitions (rounding effects) in macroscopic disordered systems, see e.g. [5, 6, 28].

In this paper, we follow a bipartite implementation of the quantum system (1.1) – (1.2), in which one first takes the "macroscopic" limit $N \to \infty$ for the whole composite $\mathfrak{S}$ of (1.1) and then studies the large block asymptotics of the entanglement entropy (2.10), for $L \to \infty$. It is worth noting that one can consider another implementation of (1.1) – (1.2), in which N and L tend to infinity simultaneously, say

$$L \sim N^{\alpha}, \ \alpha \in (0, 1], \tag{5.1}$$

see e.g. [35] for the case $\alpha = 1$.

For disordered systems considered in this paper, the finite size effects associated with the "meso"-scaling (5.1) are negligible because of the exponential localization, see (4.41 –

(4.42)) and the discussion in [4, 6, 15]. Consequently, the scaling (5.1) of the whole bipartite composite and its block leaves our results essentially unchanged.

On the other hand, the large block behavior of the entanglement entropy of translation invariant (clean) systems may be different in the scaling (5.1). This is already seen from the following simple argument. Set $\mathcal{D} = [-N, N]$ and $\Lambda = [-L_1, L_2] \subset [-N, N]$ and take as one body Hamiltonian the one dimensional discrete Laplacian $\Delta^{\mathcal{D}}$. Then it follows from Lemma 4.1 (iv) that there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$S_\Lambda \geq C|L_2 - L_1|, \ L_{1,2} = c_{1,2} N^{\alpha_{1,2}}, \ \alpha_{1,2} \in (0, 1].$$

Such behavior is typical for the so called thermal entanglement [7, 14, 27], i.e., for S_Λ given by (2.10) with the Fermi projection P replaced by a smooth function of the Hamiltonian, [22], the Fermi distribution $(1 + \mathrm{e}^{\beta(t-\mu)})^{-1}$, $\beta < \infty$ in particular. Note that $|L_1 - L_2|$ is not the length (one dimensional volume) of our block $[-L_1, L_2]$, but rather a measure of its asymmetry inside our system $[-N, N]$.

The results presented in Section 2 concern the von Neumann entanglement entropy (1.3), which for free fermion systems can be written as the one body quantity (2.10), discussed in (2.6) – (2.11) and (2.26) – (2.28). However, our more general results of Sections 3 and 4 treat the more general quantity (3.1). Thus, we can apply the results of Section 3 and 4 to the quantum analog of the Rényi entropy (Rényi entanglement entropy),

$$R_\Lambda^{(\alpha)} = (\alpha - 1)^{-1} \log \mathrm{tr}_\Lambda \, \rho_\Lambda^\alpha, \ \alpha \in (0, \infty), \ \alpha \neq 1, \tag{5.2}$$

which, for free fermion systems, can be written as

$$R_\Lambda^{(\alpha)} = \mathrm{Tr}\, r_\alpha(P_\Lambda), \ r^{(\alpha)}(t) = (\alpha - 1)^{-1} \log(t^\alpha + (1 - t)^\alpha), \tag{5.3}$$

i.e., again as a one body quantity.

We remark that (5.2) converges to (1.3) as $\alpha \to 1$ provided that $\log_2$ in (1.3) is replaced by log, the base e (natural) logarithm. Similarly, (5.3) converges to the expressions given by (2.10) and (2.7) as $\alpha \to 1$ with the same replacement. It is known, [26], that the large block behavior of the Rényi entanglement entropy of free translation invariant fermions is analogous to that of the von Neumann entanglement entropy, i.e., it has logarithmic corrections to the area law.

Since the function $r_0^{(\alpha)}$, defined by the relation $r^{(\alpha)}(t) = r_0^{(\alpha)}(t(1-t))$ (cf. with its analogue h_0 in (2.26)), satisfies Condition 3.1, the results of Section 3 apply. Thus, the large block behavior of the Rényi entanglement entropy of the disordered free fermions is similar to that of the von Neumann entropy. In particular, the expectation of the entanglement Rényi entropy satisfies the area law for any $d \geq 1$, the entropy itself is selfaveraging for $d \geq 2$, and is not selfaveraging for $d = 1$.

Finally, let us comment on a link of our results with the Szegő theorem. Recall that the theorem considers the large box asymptotics of $\mathrm{Tr}\, \varphi(A_\Lambda)$, where A_Λ is the restriction to $\Lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ (see (2.20) of a selfadjoint convolution operator $A = \{A(x-y)\}_{x,y \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ and $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}$ is a function. It is known that [10, 38]

$$\mathrm{Tr}\, \varphi(A_\Lambda) = L^d \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \varphi(a(p)) dp + L^{d-1} \Psi_d + o(L^{d-1}), \ L \to \infty, \tag{5.4}$$

where $a : \mathbb{T}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is the Fourier transform of $\{A(x)\}_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ and Ψ_d is a functional of a and φ. The functions a and φ are known as the symbol of A and the test function. It is important to bear in mind that (5.4) is valid only if a and φ are regular enough. However, if a is piece-wise constant, then the second (sub-leading) term of the formula is $\widetilde{\Psi}_d \, L^{d-1} \log L$. Not

surprisingly, these asymptotic formulas are directly related to the entanglement entropy and were in fact strongly motivated by quantum information theory [16, 19, 26, 39, 40, 43].

Let us confine ourselves to the case $d = 1$ and consider the operator of multiplication by p in $L^2(\mathbb{T})$ as the symbol of the self-adjoint operator $\widehat{p}$ in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$. Then we can write the r.h.s. of (5.4) as $\operatorname{Tr} \varphi((a(\widehat{p}))_\Lambda)$. This naturally leads us to consider a more general setting, where one chooses a "standard" convolution operator B and studies the asymptotic behavior of $\operatorname{Tr} \varphi((a(B))_\Lambda)$ as $|\Lambda| := L \to \infty$ and its dependence on the pair (a, φ). Note that convolution operators are a particular case of ergodic operators (2.15), namely, with $\Omega = \{0\}$. Thus, we can extend the above general setting for the Szegő theorem to ergodic operators by just choosing a certain "standard" ergodic operator, say the discrete Schrödinger operator H with ergodic potential (2.3), and study the asymptotics of the random variable $\operatorname{Tr} \varphi((a(H))_\Lambda)$. A particular case of this setting, where a and φ are smooth enough, was considered in [22]. In this case, whenever the potential is i.i.d. random, it was found that for $d = 1$ the subleading term in the analog of (5.4) is not Ψ_1 but $L^{1/2}$ times a suitable Gaussian random variable. Likewise, the case in which $\varphi = h$ (with h defined in (2.7)) and $a = \chi_{(-\infty,\mu]}$ corresponds to the entanglement entropy (2.10), and Results 1 – 4 establish several new asymptotic forms of corresponding traces in this (non-smooth) case.

Acknowledgement We wish to express our special thanks to J. Fillman for careful reading of a draft of this manuscript, numerous corrections and suggestions that markedly improved the final version. We are grateful to A. Sobolev for numerous discussions and for drawing our attention to his work [41], which allowed us to make the paper more transparent and the results (especially Result 4 and Theorem 3.7) stronger. L.P. would like to thank the Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences (Cambridge) for its hospitality during the program "Periodic and Ergodic Spectral Problems", May 2015 supported by EPSRC Grant Number EP/K032208/1 and the Erwin Schrödinger Institute (Vienna) for its hospitality during the program "Quantum Many Body Systems, Random Matrices and Disorder", July 2015. Financial support of grant 4/16-M of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine is also acknowledged. A.E. is supported in part by NSF under grant DMS-1210982.

References

[1] Abdul-Rahman, H., Nachtergaele, B., Sims, R., Stolz, G.: Entanglement dynamics of disordered quantum XY chains. Lett. Math. Phys. **106**, 649–674 (2016)

[2] Abdul-Rahman, H., Stolz, G.: A uniform area law for the entanglement of the states in the disordered XY chain. J. Math. Phys. **56**, 121901 (2015)

[3] Aizenman, M., Graf, G. M.: Localization bounds for an electron gas. J. Phys. A **31**, 6783 – 6806 (1998)

[4] Aizenman, M., Schenker, J.M., Friedrich, R. M., Hundertmark, D.: Finite-volume fractional-moment criteria for Anderson localization. Commun. Math. Phys. **224**, 219 – 253 (2001)

[5] Aizenman, M., Greenblatt, R. L., Lebowitz J.L.: Proof of rounding by quenched disorder of first order transitions in low-dimensional quantum systems. J. Math. Phys. **53**, 023301 (2012)

[6] Aizenman, M., Warzel, S.: Random Operators : Disorder Effects on Quantum Spectra and Dynamics. AMS, Providence (2015)

[7] Amico, L., Fazio, R., Osterloh, A., Vedral, V.: Entanglement in many body systems. Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 517 – 578 (2008)

[8] Benatti, F., Floreanini, R., Marzolino, U. Entanglement in fermion systems and quantum metrology. Phys. Rev. A **89**, 032326 (2014)

[9] Bogolyubov N. N., Bogolyubov N. N. Jr.: Introduction to Quantum Statistical Mechanics. World Scientific Publishing, Hackensack (2010)

[10] Böttcher, A., Silbermann, B.: Analysis of Töplitz Operators. Springer, Berlin (1990)

[11] Brandao, F., Horodecki M.: Exponential decay of correlations implies area law. Commun. Math. Phys. **333**, 761 – 798 (2015)

[12] Calabrese, P., Cardy, J., Doyon, B.: Entanglement entropy in extended systems. J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **42**, 500301 (2009)

[13] Dahlsten, O.C.O., Lupo, C., Mancini, S., Serafini, A.: Entanglement typicality. J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **47**, 363001 (2014)

[14] Eisert, J., Cramer, M., Plenio, M. B.: Area laws for the entanglement entropy. Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 277 (2010)

[15] Germinet, F., Taarabt, A.: Spectral properties of dynamical localization for Schrödinger operators. Rev. Math. Phys. **25**, 1350016 (2013)

[16] Gioev, D., Klich, I.: Entanglement entropy of fermions in any dimension and the Widom conjecture. Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 100503 (2006)

[17] Hastings, M. B.: Locality in quantum and Markov dynamics on lattices and networks, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 140402 (2004)

[18] Hastings, M. B.: An area law for one dimensional quan- tum systems. J. Stat. Mech. Theory Exp. P08024 (2007)

[19] Helling, R. C., Leschke, H., Spitzer, W. L.: A special case of a conjecture by Widom with implications to fermionic entanglement entropy. Int. Math. Res. Notices, 1451 – 1482 (2011)

[20] Horodecki, R., Horodecki, P., Horodecki, M., Horodecki, K.: Quantum entanglement. Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 – 942 (2009)

[21] Jitomirskaya, S., Kruger, H.: Exponential dynamical localization for the almost Mathieu operator. Commun. Math. Phys. **322**, 877 – 882 (2013)

[22] Kirsch, W., Pastur, L.: On the analogues of Szegö's theorem for ergodic operators. Sbornik: Mathematics. **206:1**, 93 – 119 (2015)

[23] Killoran, N., Cramer, M., Plenio, M. B. Extracting entanglement from identical particles. Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 150501 (2014)

[24] Fomin, S. V., Kornfel'd, I.P., Sinai, Ya. G. Ergodic theory. Springer, Berlin (1981)

[25] Laflorencie, N.: Quantum entanglement in condensed matter systems. Physics Reports **643**, 1–59 (2016)

[26] Leschke, H., Sobolev, A., Spitzer, W.: Scaling of Rényi entanglement entropies of the free Fermi-gas ground state: a rigorous proof. Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 160403 (2014)

[27] Leschke H., Sobolev A. V., Spitzer W.: Large-scale behaviour of local and entanglement entropy of the free Fermi gas at any temperature. J. Phys. A **49**, 30LT04 (2016).

[28] Lifshitz, I.M., Gredeskul, S.A., Pastur, L.A.: Introduction to the Theory of Disordered Systems. Wiley, NY, 1989

[29] Minami, N.: Local fluctuation of the spectrum of a multidimensional Anderson tight binding model. Commun. Math. Phys. **177**, 709 – 725 (1996)

[30] Nachtergaele, B., Sims, R., Stolz, G.: An area law for the bipartite entanglement of disordered oscillator systems. J. Math. Phys. **54**, 042110 (2013)

[31] Pastur, L. A., Figotin, A. L.: Theory of disordered spin systems. Teor. Math. Phys., **32**, 615 – 623 (1978).

[32] Pastur, L. A., Figotin, A. L.: Spectra of Random and Almost Periodic Operators. Berlin: Springer, Berlin (1992)

[33] Pastur, L., Slavin, V.: Area law scaling for the entropy of disordered quasifree fermions. Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 150404 (2014)

[34] Peschel, I., Eisler, V.: Reduced density matrices and entanglement entropy in free lattice models. J. Phys. A **42**, 504003 (2009)

[35] Pouranvari, M., Zhang, Y., Yang, K.: Entanglement area law in disordered free fermion Anderson model in one, two, and three dimensions. Advances in Condensed Matter Physics, 397630 (2015)

[36] Ruelle, D.: Statistical Mechanics: Rigorous Results. Benjamin, Reading (1977)

[37] Shi, Y.: Quantum entanglement in second quantized condensed matter systems. J. Phys. A **37**, 6807 – 6822 (2004).

[38] Simon, B.: Szegő's Theorem and its Descendants. Spectral Theory for L^2 Perturbations of Orthogonal Polynomials. Princeton University Press, Princeton (2011)

[39] Sobolev, A.V.: Quasi-classical asymptotics for pseudodifferential operators with discontinuous symbols: Widom's conjecture. Functional Analysis and Its Applications **44**, 313 – 317 (2010)

[40] Sobolev, A.V.: Pseudodifferential Operators with Discontinuous Symbols: Widom's Conjecture. Memoirs of the AMS, **222**. AMS, Providence (2013)

[41] Sobolev, A. V.: Functions of self-adjoint operators in ideals of compact operators. arXiv:1504.07261

[42] Stolz, G.: An introduction to the mathematics of Anderson localization. In: *Entropy and the Quantum II*. Contemp. Math., **552**, 71 – 108. AMS, Providence (2011)

[43] Wolf, M. M.: Violation of the entropic area law for fermions. Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 010404 (2008)